THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4 DECEMBER Vol. XLIV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Modern Ecumenic Movement

Solomon is twice cited in *Proverbs* as asserting that in the multitude of counsellors there is safety. Jesus is cited by *Matthew* as saying: Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them (*Mt.* xviii, 19, 20). Robertson of Brighton preached a sermon on the 'Wisdom of Christ and the Wisdom of Solomon': the one prophetic, the other prudential.

The most notable ages in Church history, e.g. the age of the Arian Controversy, the age of the Crusades, the age of the great Schism, the age of the Protestant Reformation, were ages of Church Councils. How much they contributed to the welfare of the Christian Church is open to doubt. In Church History it is not to Church Councils but to the personality of individual Christians that the Church is supremely indebted for its spiritual life.

Great spiritual and ethical movements seem always to have originated with the individual and the subsequent corporate organization deprived the original inspiration of its vitality and vigour. Yet without the subsequent corporate organization the creative gift of the spiritual genius would not have survived. This is the problem with which Christian history is successively faced. How to propagate the Spirit of the Founder without allowing it to be strangled by the organization which that Spirit has generated. This is the recurring problem in Church history and to-day we are facing it again in the modern ecumenic movement.

The events and ideals of this Movement are lucidly summarized by Dr. J. R. H. Moorman in *A History of the Church of England*[1]:

> 'The great missionary conference at Edinburgh in 1910 had laid the foundations of international and interdenominational co-operation in the sphere of world evangelism. Further Conferences of a similar kind were held at Jerusalem in 1928 and at Tambaram near Madras in 1938 . . . A Conference was held at Stockholm in 1925 to consider the mind and conscience of Christians on the social and economic questions with which the world was faced. . . . Twelve years later a second conference was held, this time at Oxford. Out of these conferences was born the "Life and Work" movement.
>
> But the fundamental questions which divided Christendom were not practical, but theological; and though co-operation could be achieved, there could be no real unity or fellowship so long as these questions were ignored. Thus, in addition to the "Life and Work" movement further conferences were held to discuss "Faith and Order." The first of these met at Lausanne in 1927 with Headlam and Gore as the Anglican leaders, and the second at Edinburgh in 1937 with Temple as its chairman. As a result of these conferences the World Council of Churches came into being in 1938.
>
> The Second World War put an end to further international conferences, but in England a British Council of Churches was formed in 1942 to provide a meeting-ground where Anglicans and Nonconformists could discuss social and moral problems. After the war international co-operation was resumed at the first assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948. At this great gathering representatives of most of the Churches except the Roman Catholic were present, important discussions took place, and machinery was set up for further meetings at regular intervals' (p. 420 f).

The latest and greatest of the ecumenic conferences has just concluded at Evanston, U.S.A.

The Evanston World Council of Churches

The attendance at the World Council of Churches at Evanston far surpassed in its numbers the attendance at any preceding Ecumenic Conference: its enthusiasm was immense and the attention it received in the Press was world-wide. Its theme *Christ the Hope of the World* was indeed well chosen, but how far the Evanston gathering succeeded in the effective advancement of its Cause—the unification of the Christian Church and the advancement of Christian civilization in the non-Christian world—cannot be decided at this stage. We append, however, some significant comments derived from different view points.

[1] Adam and Charles Black, 25/-, 1953. Cf. also *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* 1517–1948, edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill, S.P.C.K. 32/6, and *The Kingship of Christ* (a Penguin Special) by the Bishop of Chichester.

President Eisenhower personally welcomed the Assembly in a speech opening with the words :

> ' There are many good reasons why I am so delighted to meet with this Assembly . . . this wonderful body of world representatives. . . . The citizens of the United States feel highly honoured that you have chosen this country in which to hold your second Assembly . . . because you are a world body of spiritual leaders.'

A month before the Evanston Assembly, a responsible Roman Catholic preacher in a Broadcast sermon explained why it was completely out of the question that Rome should take the slightest official notice of the World Council and yet at the same time why his hearers should give thanks for this great movement towards unity among non-Catholics, and should pray that it might prove to be the precursor of their ultimate admission into the one true Church of Christ.

Professor Bradshaw, an eminent Free Churchman, in his recently published book, *Free Churches and Christian Unity: a Critical View of the Ecumenical Movement and the World Council of Churches*[2], sees in the Ecumenic Movement a fatal threat to the freedom, independence and variety of Christian witness.

> ' Christians who treasure membership in free churches must devise new protection against pressure tactics now employed in behalf of unity—a unity which . . . is openly based upon theological uniformity and ultimately repressive of all characteristic denominational distinctions.'

Ewind Bergrav, former Primate of the Lutheran Church of Norway, and one of the five Presidents of the World Council of Churches, has long advocated joint communion. His comment on Evanston may be summed up thus :

> ' The Churches have talked so long about what unites us and what divides us that if we are to get further we must take a step forward—inter-communion at the same Communion Table.'

The *Modern Churchman* has long advocated this step forward and most recently in our Article *Lambeth and Reunion: a More Excellent Way*[3].

The American Branch of the Anglican Communion, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U.S.A., has already instituted this practice and accordingly, under the leadership of its Presiding Bishop, Henry Knox Sherrill, invited all baptized communicants of every denomination to share in their united Holy Communion Service. We have to add, however, that a group of Anglo-Catholics at Evanston ' picketed ' the united Holy Communion

[2] Reviewed in the October, 1954, *Hibbert Journal*, by Mortimer Rowe.

[3] Blackwells, Oxford. Also the M.C.U. Office, 9 Ironmonger Lane, London, E.C. ; price 6d. ; 1949.

service and distributed a leaflet to would-be communicants urging them not to join in the service. The *Church Times* of August 27 commented as follows on the incident:

> 'One unhappy precedent, made at the World Council meetings in Europe and America, has been the "open" Communion. . . . The open Communion is an affront to many consciences, and should be stopped. No Eastern Orthodox can communicate: many English Catholics will not. The tragedy of forcing the issue has been underlined at Evanston, when a handful of American Catholics apparently felt themselves led to the unhappy expedient of picketing the service, in their protest that it was "an official act of schism."'

This incident may be regarded by some as a well-deserved rebuke administered to the American Branch of the Anglican Communion for its timid tolerance, but viewed historically the picketing incident is a testimony to the progressive comprehensiveness of that Church.

It is most appropriate, however, that we should conclude our selection of testimonies with the official report on the conference at Evanston delivered by the Bishop of Durham to the Upper House of the York Convocation as published in the *Church Times* of October 29. The Bishop reported

> 'that very little that was new or significant had been said at this conference; its value had lain far more in personal contacts than in discussions and resolutions. It had been hampered by the unwieldiness of the hall and the number of delegates and others attending the meetings; by the overloading of the programme; and by the wrong type of preliminary "boosting" that it had received.
>
> The first week had been devoted to the main theme, "the Christian Hope." The second week had been taken up with the work of six sections. One on "Faith and Order" had carried forward the theological work of sorting out remaining doctrinal differences. One of the most notable things it had said was that there was a great moral danger in repeating phrases about the desirability of union, unless something was done about it.
>
> The Bishop said that in the matter of reunion he noted the prominence of what he would call the ideology of American denominationalism. We had divisions in England; but we acknowledged that they were contrary to the will of Christ. In America many denominations appeared to believe that, as long as intercommunion could be achieved, it was in fact God's will that the denominations should continue as separate entities, overarched by the World Council of Churches as a sort of Jerusalem above. He was more than ever convinced of the vocation of the Anglican Communion to bear witness to its heritage of historic Church order as something God-given for a means of deliverance from denominational divisions.'

But surely Bishop Ramsey's antithesis is a false one due to his identifying ecclesiastical uniformity with Christian unity. Christians have got to learn how to differ ecclesiastically without allowing these differences either to divide them against each other

or to reduce their united loyalty to Christ as the Hope of the World. The Authorised Version's mistranslation of *John* x, 16 has done its deadly work in our Anglican traditionalist thinking by predicting that the one flock is to be incorporated into *one fold*, and not that the one flock is to secure its unity by its loyalty to one Shepherd: 'They shall hear my voice; and they shall become *one flock*.'

Church of South India: To-day and To-Morrow

Canon Vidler, the Editor of *Theology*, has published an extraordinarily valuable contribution towards the deeper understanding of the South India Church and one which can have no little influence in determining the decision which the Lambeth Conference has to face next year.

Theology, July 1954, contains four articles prefaced by an editorial devoted to the Church of South India as experienced by four of its representative members:

Rev. J. Chandran, Principal of the United College of Bangalore;
Rev. D. Chellapa, Headmaster of St. Paul's School, Madras, and Editor of the *South India Churchman;*
Rev. W. Elphick, Principal of Bishop Cotton Boys' School and head of the Brotherhood of St. Peter;
Rev. L. M. Schiff, S.P.G. Missionary in Bangalore.

The Editor of *Theology* thus introduces these four contributions:

> 'We wish to leave these articles to speak for themselves, and no attempt has been made to ensure that their testimony is concordant. The only conclusion which at this stage we ourselves feel bound to draw is that in 1955 the Church of England will have no excuse for not reaching a definite decision about its relations with the Church of South India. We are inclined to believe that the capacity of our ecclesiastical leaders for contriving, and of our legislative assemblies for passing, resolutions that avoid or defer settling controversial issues has on several occasions been an advantage to our Church: in the present case, it may well have been so in 1950. But this art or gift can demoralize or degrade a Church if it becomes a habit. If the Church of England cannot make up its mind in 1955 about whether it ought or ought not to be in full communion with the Church of South India, it will be hopelessly discredited in the field of Church relations. . . . A definite decision in 1955—one way or the other—will clear the air, and will relieve the Church of England of what otherwise will have become an intolerable burden of equivocation' (p. 242).

Following the example of the Editor of *Theology* we leave these articles to speak for themselves to what we hope will be a multitude of readers, but we cannot resist citing significant utterances from them which will indicate what readers will miss

who do not study the articles from which these utterances are selected. In the concluding sentence of his testimony Mr. Chandran writes :

> ' The Church's task, therefore, is not simply to maintain a static order which came into being at a particular period in history, but in the power of the Holy Spirit to grow into fuller knowledge of her salvation and to manifest that knowledge in her life and witness ' (p. 250).

The following statements are from the Rev. David Chellapa's paper :

> ' It is, of course, essential that the C.S.I. should be related to the soil if it is to survive, but far more essential, even, is it that it should be rooted in Christ and keep in close touch with the Universal Church if it is not to become so national as to be less than Christian (p. 251).

Dealing with the Liturgy of the Church of South India the Rev. David Chellapa writes :

> ' The whole Service is an attempt to recover the corporate character of the primitive Eucharist. It is also a comprehensive Service in that it has borrowed from the Syrian Qurbana, the Roman Mass, the second-century Didache, the Mozarabic Rite of early Spain, the Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, and the customs common among the " people called methodists " among other sources ' (p. 252).

The Rev. David Chellapa concludes his paper with a citation from Newbigin's *The Household of God* (pp. 151-2). ' The unity of the Church will not distil out of a process of purely theological discussions ' (p. 257). Principal Elphick thus sums up his answer to the question why he and his Anglo-Catholic brethren

> ' took such a perilous step, from a strictly orthodox point of view, as to throw in our lot at all with the C.S.I.' (p. 257).
>
> ' Whether we like it or not the C.S.I. is in existence and it contains within it very large numbers of ex-Anglicans. Is the Anglican Church going to leave this large number of its own people unshepherded? We think that the majority decision at Lambeth 1948 and in the Convocations of Canterbury and York was generous towards us ex-Anglicans. We realize that because of its anomalies the C.S.I. cannot at the present time be in full communion with the Anglican Communion, and we are grateful that our place as individuals, both clergy and laity, in the Church of our upbringing has been safeguarded for us. To the more sticky minority we would say: Do you desire that the many ex-Anglicans in the C.S.I. shall lapse from their loyalty to those beliefs and practices for which the Anglican tradition stands? If you do not, then you must give people like us your sympathy, your help, and your prayers. We are trying to carry out a difficult task—and one which sometimes goes against the grain. Is it a task which you really wish should be left undone? ' (p. 262).

The Rev. L. M. Schiff writes with his Indian outlook coloured by his year's furlough in England :

> ' How can the Church become self-supporting? What is the contribution of Indian thought to theology? An experiment is being made in a " voluntary " ministry, which may be a return to New Testament

practice or something rather like "priest-workmen." Groups in the Church are becoming greatly concerned about the social witness of Christians and the devolopment of lay leadership. . . .

It may be that in South India we also have something to contribute. For the Church is young, faced with great odds; it is a *stripped* Church with a strong sense of eschatology and a growing theology of the Holy Spirit. The young Pilgrim Church and the old culture Church can give to one another' (p. 264).

We wonder whether the C.S.I. has not more to teach the Church of England than we in England have to teach the C.S.I.

Oxford Culture and the Basic Christian Creed

The *Sunday Times* of September 26 published the following axiomatic conviction of modern Christian faith contributed by Mr. Keith Gillison:

'The revolution of Communism can be met only by the greatest revolution of all time, whereby a vital and convincing Christianity will rebuild the world.'

On this statement Mr. Lionel Curtis commented as follows in the *Sunday Times* of October 3.

The new Fellows elected yearly to All Souls College, Oxford, from which I am writing, are the intellectual cream of the University. I notice that with few exceptions they treat religion as a subject which educated men are not called upon to consider. When Dives pleaded to Abraham that his brethren might be saved from his own fate, if someone from the dead could warn them in time, Abraham replied: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they be persuaded if one rose from the dead."

In the face of this Paul wrote "If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain" (*I Corinthians* xv, 14). Since that time the Churches have held that the miracle of His resurrection is the essential proof of Our Lord's teaching. In plain words, the Churches base their creed on a foundation that many educated people see to be false.

I believe that our consciences are the revelation of truth to us by God. When Our Lord propounded the doctrine of immortality, when He said "God is the God of the living and not of the dead," or the doctrine that "God is love," my conscience tells me that His words are true and that no miracle is needed to prove their truth. I submit that when the Churches offer this as the basis of their creed, they will open the doors of Christianity to educated people.

In demanding a Christian Faith which does not demand miracles as its needful support Mr. Lionel Curtis is loyal to the teaching of Jesus Himself. *Mk.* viii, 11-12 records:

'And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him. And he sighed deeply in his Spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek a sign? Verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.'

The source Q as cited in *Mt.* xii, 41 and *Lk.* xi, 32, records a saying of Jesus that the men of Nineveh shall rise up in the Judgement against this generation (i.e. the seeking of signs to support

spiritual truth) and shall condemn it for the Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah; and 'behold a greater than Jonah is here.' Prophetic preaching sufficed to convert the Ninevites. Those who demanded more for their own conversion were to be condemned.

Mt. xii, 39 (Source M), an obvious early Christian interpolation and misinterpretation of the reference to Jonah, states that Jonah's three days and three nights in the belly of the whale was cited by Jesus as a prediction of the sign of His Messiahship which Jesus Himself would give to that generation.

It is not to Jesus but to the Apostolic Church and its Jewish inheritance (*I Cor.* i, 22) that we owe the demand for miraculous signs as a needful support of Divine Revelation. On this point Mr. Lionel Curtis is loyal to the teaching of Jesus Himself even when that teaching is contradicted by Apostolic Apologetic.

Jaw is Better Than Law

Sir Winston Churchill in 'a jewel, five words long,' told the United and Disunited nations that 'Jaw is better than War.' This is a *dictum* calculated to calm the impatience of a public worn out with incessant conferences on how to secure world peace. Our astute Prime Minister pointed out to his impatient public a *tertium quid* which in their impatience they had failed to recognize. It is that interminable controversy is better than actual conflict.

A similar situation exists in what Augustine Birrell has called 'the troublesome history of the Church of England.' This situation is created by the conflict of ecclesiastical ideals, in which the adherents of the triumphant party seek to secure legal authority for the suppression of their opponents. So is it to-day in the Church of England. Our Anglo-Catholics, after a prolonged struggle, marked on their side by persevering self-sacrifice and courage, have at last achieved a temporary majority domination in the Church of England. Their practical right to exist having been granted they now demand the *legal* right to rule. This situation is clearly recognized in the recently published Archbishop's *Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts*[4].

This latest Report acknowledges that it is beyond the power of Church or Parliament to control *legally* Anglo-Catholic liturgical practice—legal uniformity in that sphere although it may be ideally desirable is now, the Commission asserts, legally impossible. The Report sums the situation up as follows:

> 'We welcome what has already been achieved in the revision of the Canons towards ending the divergence between law and practice in

[4] Published by S.P.C.K.; 15/6; 1954.

public worship. It is conditional on this work being carried to completion that we recommend the adoption of the procedure set out in the following pages, for the correction of ritual and ceremonial as well as doctrinal offences, and the consequent abolition of the procedure contained in the Church Discipline Act, 1940, and the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874. If in spite of what already has been achieved in the new Canons, the Church decides that the time is not yet ripe for any further action towards ending the divergence between law and practice in public worship, we can see no useful purpose in at present including in our proposals any but doctrinal cases' (p. 74).

But can any useful purpose be served by retaining *doctrinal* differences as causes for disciplinary legal proceedings?

In the present Church situation no useful purpose, as the Report recognizes, can be served by instituting legal proceedings against the adherents of ritual and ceremonial aberrations. What useful purpose, in view of the situation revealed by the 1936 *Report on Doctrine* in the Church of England, can possibly be served by prosecutions of what may be regarded by some as doctrinal aberrations?

Granted that legal trials must to-day be abandoned for better methods in the sphere of liturgical aberrations it is equally clear that legal trials must be abandoned in the doctrinal sphere. These better modern methods ought to be pastoral, educational and evolutional, but in arriving at their conclusions our administrators have to cover a very wide field of historical research, social psychology, educational potentialities, and variant local conditions.

Such studies must demand much time and much discussion, but until full use has been made of them we cannot hope to secure beneficial compromises and liberating conclusions. Hence the question naturally arises whether these beneficial compromises and liberating conclusions can be either usefully expressed or adequately embodied in the form of revised ecclesiastical Canons. If, as Aristotle profoundly affirmed, 'The true nature of a thing is that which it is when its becoming is completed,' it is not ecclesiastical traditionalism nor legal formulation but prophetic foresight and insight which is demanded in this perilous undertaking.

Perilous it is indeed for wrong decisions will lead to the silent desertion of great multitudes from the national Church, but more perilous is it because the legal method is profoundly hostile to the spirit of Christ. Law in its basic and profoundest sense must be a fundamental concept in our religious life, but that law, to use St. Paul's phrase, is 'the law of God after the inward man' in which St. Paul delighted (*Rom.* vii, 22).

But there was another kind of law towards which St. Paul was intensely hostile: a law inscribed in ordinances from which he thanked God that Christ had delivered him. How often does St. Paul refer to this other kind of law as the enemy of the Gospel of Christ and of that Christian righteousness which is by faith.

It is this kind of law which our canonists are engaged in revising with the object of authorising it for the purposes of Anglo-Catholic Church discipline to be fastened, if possible, round the necks of the laity as well as round the necks of the clergy. If this attempted legal revision of the canons only consisted in the waste of the time of busy bureacurats and was destined to end there we could console ourselves with the reflection that Jaw is better than Law, but unfortunately this canonical revision promises to create and enforce law which must end in war—war between the reactionary traditionalists who would bring us again under the yoke of bondage the 'law of commandments contained in ordinances which Christ "our peace" has abolished (*Ephesians* ii, 14, 15) and the freedom-loving, prophetically-minded members of the Church of England who believe wholeheartedly that "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty".' Liberty—realized not in licentiousness, but in the spiritual and moral experience of Christian endeavour.

But it is only fair to recognize that this campaign for Canonical Revision is prompted by religious zeal although it be zeal without knowledge. It seeks to increase the influence of the Church of England and it believes that this can best be done by tightening up the discipline of our Church after the example of the Roman Church. It fails to recognize, however, that the post-Reformation Roman Church differs fundamentally from the post-Reformation English Church.

The Roman Church is legalist—the English Church is non-legalist. The Roman Church was described by an English philosophical historian as 'The Ghost of the Roman Empire sitting crowned on the grave thereof' and the conception of Church Reform practised by the Roman *Curia* is essentially imperialist and legalist—multiply regulations, tighten up ecclesiastical discipline.

This legalist method may have its use in primitive cultures, but is futile when dealing with English civilization and with the English Church of Cranmer, Latimer, the Judicious Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Thomas Fuller, the Cambridge Platonists, Tillotson, Bishop Butler, Edmund Burke, F. D. Maurice, Matthew Arnold, Hastings Rashdall, W. E. Addis, Streeter, Burkitt, Bethune-Baker, R. H. Charles and Dean Inge.

THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

By the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's

Paper read before the Society for the Study of Theology

THE question, What is the nature of religious knowledge, and the related question, What is the relation of the truth which religion claims to impart with other types of truth, have recently come very clearly into the centre of discussion, but the problem which they present is not itself new. It arises from the nature of religion, and perhaps most definitely from the special character of the Christian religion. It may be convenient to take a brief survey of the problem in its general and permanent features before we consider the particular form which it has assumed at the present time.

Religion certainly claims to be a disclosure of truth. It has indeed almost universally made a more sweeping claim, nothing less than to be *the* truth, a truth so supremely important and far-reaching that all other truths are subordinate to it. At the same time, this religious truth is distinguished from other kinds of truth by the fact that it is held to be conveyed to us by means which are not the same as those through which we learn scientific or historical truth and to rest upon an authority other, and more august, than theirs. The truths of religion came to us, or at least some of them came to us, it is generally agreed by 'revelation'. Leaving on one side the question of the precise meaning of revelation, we may at least agree that, in so far as revelation is a source from which we derive true knowledge, it is not the same as the ordinary processes of reasoning and enquiry by which truth in other spheres of thought is discovered and established. But here we have to notice an important qualification. If we examine the truths which, as we hold, rest upon revelation, or are intimately connected with it, we find, at any rate in Christianity, that some of them appear to have the nature of historical knowledge, others of scientific and others again to be metaphysical. 'Crucified under Pontius Pilate', 'In the beginning God created the World', 'God exists', whatever else these statements may be, they have the character of historical, scientific and metaphysical assertions respectively and are proper subjects for criticism by historical, scientific and metaphysical methods.

A further evidence of the close connexion of religion with knowledge is the description which religion gives of the ultimate goal and blessedness of those who follow its way. In different terms, but with substantial agreement, all the higher religions could accept

the Christian phrase, 'to know God', as the word which expresses the consummation of the spirit's quest. We must, of course, at once draw the distinction between 'knowing God' and 'knowing about God'. It is certainly not the attaining of a clear and adequate concept of Deity which sums up the heavenly hope. Yet an apostolic writer reminds us that we cannot separate knowing God from knowing about Him. 'He that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that seek Him'. To generalize this, spiritual knowledge cannot be completely divorced from conceptual knowledge, or spiritual truth from propositional truth. If this is the case, it is obvious that some very difficult problems arise concerning the relation of conceptual knowledge and that deeper knowledge which is the fulfilment of our souls' thirst.

No doubt one of the consequences of this apparent difference and yet close association between conceptual knowledge and some higher kind of knowing is the source of the tension in theology between reason and revelation and the long debate, now more vigorous than ever, on the status and value of Natural Theology. Perhaps it would not be an excessive simplification to say that the question at issue is the status and justification of the propositions which are used in theology. Clearly, even the simplest theological statement, such as the Apostle's creed, must consist of propositions which are alleged to be true. Whence do they come and on what authority are they made? Are they ultimately based on some immediate knowledge of God, whether present or past, on some experience which carries its own authentication, or, on the contrary, are they propositions which are verifiable by the ordinary processes of logical thought and differ from other propositions only by the fact that they are concerned with religious subjects? I suppose that most theologians would attempt some kind of compromise — the more polite word is 'synthesis' — between reason and revelation, perhaps on the lines of regarding revelation as the data, or part of the data, on which the reason has to work. But if we take up this position, we can hardly avoid the possibility, at some point, of having to choose between reason and revelation, because reason cannot work upon the data of revelation as if the enquiry could be conducted in isolation. Once we admit the rights of reason in the field of religious knowledge. we must be prepared to bring in all the resources of reason, including those results of rational enquiry which are relevant. Then it would follow that, sooner or later, we should have to make up our minds on the question what degree, if any, of contradiction between the knowledge which comes to us by way of logical thinking or historical investigation on the one hand, and the intuitive knowledge of revelation on the other, would be

sufficient to compel us to regard the alleged revealing experience as illusory? In short, if we draw a clear distinction between reason and revelation, we shall have to decide which of them is the final authority.

We may now perhaps try another approach to the problem of religious knowledge by starting from the more subjective angle — that of the individual's apprehension of religious truth. Again we find a substantial agreement in the higher religions that the organ of religious knowledge is not the pure intellect, but some disposition of the personality which, in Christianity, is called 'faith'. It is at least certain that the New Testament teaches the necessity of faith for any genuine knowledge of God. The word 'faith' is one of those which, as St. Augustine said about something else, is much easier to explain in the pulpit than in discussion, and I do not propose here to attempt a definition. I suppose one could say at least that faith differs from the exercise of reason in philosophy and science in one important respect: when we are reasoning we try to exclude all influences which are not intellectual and to allow no personal desires or preferences to deflect our judgment. No doubt we rarely succeed in this completely, and it may be that the ideal of a purely rational state of mind is an impossible one, but it seems clear that this is what we mean when we speak of a fully rational enquiry. Faith, on the other hand, appears to be an attitude of the whole personality in which, so far from excluding feeling, imagination, hope and fear, all are brought together in an act of affirmation and trust. Faith then is clearly not identical with knowing in any accepted sense of the word, nor is it identical with belief, which is an inferior kind of knowing, knowing, one might say, in the making. Though, of course, there are degrees of belief, it could be suggested that full belief is an opinion on which we are prepared to act, either because we are forced to act on some opinion and have to choose without opportunity for careful consideration, or because we think there is a high probability that the opinion is true. I suppose that few would be willing to agree that faith is irrational, but if it is not irrational, presumably it, in some way, supplements or completes the work of reason and leads to conclusions which a more powerful, or better informed, reason than our own would corroborate. Faith and belief are intimately associated, and most of the beliefs which we call religious are accepted by us to some degree by faith. It is because we have faith that they seem to us to be true.

Now this appears to be in striking contrast to the way in which knowledge is apprehended and assented to in all other realms of enquiry. None would think for a moment of saying that he accepts

a conclusion in science, history, or philosophy because faith moves him to do so. But I suggest that this contrast between knowledge which depends on faith, and knowledge which does not, may be less decisive than it seems, for it can be argued that, in some sense, all knowing rests on faith of some kind. At the root of every branch of knowledge there are certain assumptions which are so much taken for granted that they are often not recognized as assumptions. Nevertheless, they are there, and without them the whole structure of knowledge would collapse, while they themselves are incapable of being proved. Natural science, for example, is the triumphant working out of an hypothesis that there is some intelligible order in nature, an order which the human mind is capable of understanding. That this is a kind of faith seems evident, because when new problems arise which require a revision of the formerly accepted conclusions, it never occurs to anyone to say, 'Well, here we have come to the end of the intelligible world, here the human reason must fall back finally baffled.' So far from that, the enquiry goes on, in the conviction that out of confusion rational research and reflection will create order. And yet, as far as I can see, there is nothing absurd, or even unlikely, in supposing that there might be a limit to the intelligibility of nature, that order might be only a partial character of reality, or that some aspect of being might have an order which is opaque to the human reason. These possibilities are not considered, not because they are not possibilities; they are ignored by the power of faith. It is notorious again that the uniformity of nature is a necessary presupposition of scientific research and that no alleged proof of it escapes the fallacy of begging the question. It may of course be said that, even if all knowledge rests on some kind of faith, this faith differs from religious faith in that it is purely intellectual and not an attitude of the whole personality. This, no doubt, is true in the case of those who simply work in the tradition and never look beyond its established routine of method, but when we look at the whole astonishing story of the rise and development of natural knowledge we cannot help recognizing that it is a great adventure story, the adventure of the human mind in the forlorn hope of understanding the world and of controlling, in some measure, its forces. This has been the work of a tiny minority of the human race. The vast majority of mankind has always been content to follow the established routine of life and thought with dull acceptance. Those who embarked on the adventure, and those who have been the pioneers in it ever since, have been men in whom there burned hope and a trust in the Universe, or in what is behind the Universe, which resembles religious faith. Santayana built his

philosophy on what he called 'animal faith'; a firmer foundation would be this persistent human faith.

There is, however, a difference between this faith and religious faith which is important. If we agree that knowledge, in every department, seems ultimately to rest upon faith and that it is not correct to hold that religion differs from other types of knowing simply by reason of the fact that it appeals to faith, we have to recognize that in their development the types of knowing diverge. All except religion have a criterion of truth. Perhaps science, history and philosophy all rely upon an initial act of faith which controls all their evolution, but within their framework of assumption they develop a technique by which truth is distinguished from illusion, or at least the approximations to truth are distinguished from opinions and hypotheses which are blind alleys. I think the criterion is not precisely the same in every branch of knowledge, but the two principles of coherence and loyalty to ascertained facts are present in all. It is because of this criterion that we can think without absurdity of the steady progress of human knowledge.

What is the situation in religion? Is there anything corresponding to the criterion of knowledge in this realm, and is there any sense, therefore, in which we could claim that there is, or might be, a steady progress of religious knowledge? It would be hard to prove that this is the case. Only a very dogmatic person could hold that no faith except that which agrees with his is genuine faith and, if we assemble before our minds the conclusions to which men of faith have been led, as they are convinced by divine assistance, we are confronted with an embarrassing confusion. This is not merely a theoretical difficulty, it has everyday practical effects. Which of us does not know what it is to meet someone who quite evidently has real faith and has responded with his whole personality to what he takes to be a divine call and yet is the victim of what appear to us to be dangerous delusions and absurd convictions? We may be shamed by the fervency of his faith and appalled at the conclusions to which it has led him. What is the answer to this dilemma? Do we appeal to reason, in the wide sense of the word which includes good sense? Do we appeal to logic? Do we urge that our friend should relate his experience to other experiences and harmonize them with one another? In whatever form we appeal to reason we seem to be placing it above faith as the final arbiter of what can be accepted as religious truth. And if we do not appeal to reason, to what do we appeal?

There we will leave the permanent problems of religious knowledge and pass on to a particular theory of knowledge which has

raised questions about religious statements of an alarming kind. The general problem of religious knowledge has taken on a new aspect recently because, behind the familiar questions, a new question has been raised: whether religious statements can have any meaning. The Pragmatists used to assure us that 'truth is verification'. This was a difficult thing to understand, because it seemed impossible to substitute the word 'verification' for the word 'truth' wherever it occurred without making nonsense of the whole idea of truth. I suppose that what they really meant was that the idea of truth was unnecessary and misleading. In these latter days the Logical Positivists have carried the matter further. They hold that *meaning* is equivalent to verification, or that no statement has meaning unless it is capable of being verified, and verified in a particular sense, i.e. by reference to some experience which would decide whether the statement was true or not and, unless I am mistaken, by experience they mean sense-experience. It would follow from this that religious statements are, by their very nature, non-sense, they have no real meaning. There have been developments, however, which mitigate the rigour of this theory, and I understand that some members of this school would allow a modicum of meaning in religious propositions — they express the feeling-tone of individual experience perhaps and describe the attitude of the believer to life and the world. I think that perhaps undue importance has been given to this type of philosophy by theologians. No doubt, if it were accepted, it would have a restrictive effect on theological writing, but we all agree that our words are inadequate and our propositions only a hint of the truth when we speak of divine things. I do not think that it has been noticed that one type of religion and theology could be perfectly happy with the conclusion that all religious statements are non-sense. I mean the negative kind of mysticism. Mr. W. T. Stace, in his two recent books expounding the *via negativa*, comes very near to saying that all statements about God, even the statement that God exists, are so utterly inadequate that they cannot be described as either true or false.

Logical Positivism, like Pragmatism, has derived its method and its inspiration from natural science. It is positivism carried to its logical end. But I wonder whether the scientists have cause to be grateful for this assistance, for it seems that logical positivism applied to scientific assumptions might have unexpected results. Natural science takes for granted, and I think must take for granted, that there is an objective nature to be studied which is not mind-dependent. There may be perplexities concerning how we know the external world, but there must be an external world to

know. Now the proposition, 'There is an external world', seems to be meaningless on the logical positivist view, because it cannot be verified in the only way which their theory allows. The many attempts to refute Berkeley and subjective idealism by appeal to sense-experience have broken down precisely because there is no sense-experience which could possibly by itself confirm the realist hypothesis or negate the idealistic. No doubt, in the same way, it could be shown that other fundamental assumptions of science would turn out to be equally unmeaning on the principles of logical positivism, yet we all know that they will continue to be made and acted upon.

This very imperfect survey of the problem of religious knowledge certainly offers us much ground for disquiet and occasion for anxious thought. I have not attempted in this paper to give any answers to the questions raised, partly because it would be straining your patience beyond reasonable bounds, but also partly because often I have no solution to offer. Perhaps it is not a very respectable consolation to suggest that we theologians are not alone in our troubles, though we feel them more keenly than others who are really in the same predicament, and see them more plainly. To set the problem of religious knowledge in the context of the problem of knowledge in general is obviously good policy, if we hold that all knowledge is one and all truths are elements in the absolute Truth. It may also be reassuring, for we discover that it is not only religious knowledge which is at the bar, but every kind of knowledge. By a paradox of the history of thought, this period, when knowledge is accumulating with unprecedented rapidity, is one in which there is a deep perplexity about the nature of knowledge and the meaning of truth, so that many accepted ideas are under criticism. This is notorious in the realm of science. The older notion that science gives us knowledge of the real world is no longer accepted by scientific thinkers of the first rank. The late Sir James Jeans' remark, 'Our studies can never put us into contact with reality. We can never understand what events are until man becomes endowed with more senses than he at present possesses', is only one example of many similar utterances. We could say that in science there has developed a situation which has at least some analogy with that in religion. No one doubts that scientific knowledge is real knowledge, and certainly no one proposes that scientific research should be held up, but no one can tell us what scientific knowledge is knowledge of, or in what sense it is true. The critical movement in science has been produced by the development of science itself. It comes from within and is the work of men who have devoted their lives to research. In all these

respects we may see some resemblance to our position as theologians, and naturally so, for it is the same problem of knowledge in a different context. It will be sufficient to remind you of some of the changes which have taken place in scientific theory of late. They are fundamental, because they undermine the view of scientific explanation which had prevailed for so long and still prevails in many circles to-day — explanation by the discovery of causal laws. Both these conceptions are under fire and seem destined to disappear. The concept of cause is reduced to observed sequence and natural laws are described as statistical averages. One may wonder indeed in what sense 'explanation' can still be regarded as the aim of science.

This is familiar enough. I would call attention to one aspect of the scientific problem of knowledge which may not be so well known — the validity of sense-perception. Plainly physical science starts from sense-perception and must come back to it for the verification of its hypotheses. Readers of H. Price's book on Perception will agree that the question how sense-perception can be perception of what really is appears to be obscure when treated solely from the philosophical point of view, the physiological aspect of the problem being left out of account. A recent book of Sir Russell Brain, P.R.C.P., *Mind Perception and Science*, approaches the question from the neurological standpoint, though with clear understanding of the philosophical work which has been done on the subject. The neurology is not easy for the laymen to follow, but the conclusion is plain enough. It is that the nervous system, which is the physical basis of perception, is a mechanism which produces *symbols*. These symbols have no resemblance to objects in the external world, but in some way, which I confess eludes my comprehension, they stand for the relations of the real objects to one another. This may be a misrepresentation in detail, but there is no doubt that, in Brain's view, perceptions are symbols with the depressing addendum that we have no means of knowing what they are symbols of. Even if Jeans' aspiration after more senses were granted, it seems we should be little better off, for presumably they too would only give us more complex symbols. One begins to think that Descartes was not so wide of the mark when he held that only God could assure us that our senses did not deceive us.

It would be tedious to pursue this subject further by examining historical knowledge. If we did so, we should find that here too there are fundamental questions about the nature of history and the kind of truth which we may expect to attain in it. At least it is evident enough that the description of history as the account of

'what actually happened' sets an ideal which may be attainable by angels but is beyond the compass of men. And if the phrase means *all* that actually happened, it is doubtful if that is what the historian seeks to know, while if we modify it by introducing the word 'important' and say history is the account of important events, we are met by the problem of the criterion of 'importance' which seems to have no answer except in the purpose and presuppositions of the historian.

I bring this inconclusive paper to an end with a meagre suggestion of a constructive character, which is not so much the conclusion of this essay as the beginning of another. I suggest that we make a mistake when we regard scientific knowledge as the model of knowledge to which all other types of knowing should conform so far as they are able. No doubt, most of us would deny that we held any such opinion, but the pressure of the scientific age is on us all, and we all succumb at times to the prevailing view that scientific knowledge is the ideal and would be glad to think that our theological statements had the respectability of scientific conclusions; but at the centre of our theology there is another kind of knowing, or so we assert, without which all our theology would be castles in the air. This knowing is of a different type. It is one in which the knower tends to become like what he contemplates: it is a kind of knowing in which subject and object interpenetrate, where, as it were, the knower reaches out to grasp the object, or the object reaches out to grasp the subject. When St. Paul cries, 'That I may know Him and the power of His resurrection,' he does not mean that he may know objectively that Christ rose from the dead and is assured that this is a true statement, though that is included as a subordinate element. He means that he may know the reality of the risen life by being part of it. And when he and others have, in some degree, come to know God or, what is the same thing, to be known of Him, they do not mean primarily that they have a well-founded conviction that the proposition 'God exists' is true, though that is included, but that they are partakers of the divine nature.

Perhaps if we started from the position that this is the most perfect kind of knowing, we might be able to apply the principle all down the scale of knowledge. Science is thought to be the knowledge of nature, and so in a sense it is, but it may be knowledge of only one aspect of nature, and knowledge of a particular kind — in which the knower always stands outside the object. There have been men like Goethe who believed that another kind of natural knowledge was possible, and queer people like Rudolf Steiner have made fantastic claims about what they have perceived

behind and within the natural order. The poets too have their evidence to offer, which a philosopher of nature like A. N. Whitehead received respectfully. The achievements of this type of nature-knowledge so far are meagre, but it may be that myths come from a time when the experience of being one with nature as a living whole was the common lot, and who can tell whether hereafter that experience may not return, transformed and rationalized by the scientific era? At any rate we can conceive a knowledge of nature which includes science but goes beyond it. We have seen that the idea that science gives us knowledge of the reality of nature is probably false. The perfection of the knowledge of nature would be when the mind grasped the inner reality of nature and was able, by some intuitive sympathy perhaps, to break through the barrier which separates subject and object.

Historical knowledge again seems to be imperfect in its present form. Painfully the picture of the past is built up by piecing together fragments of evidence. The past stands before us as a dead and completed object. There have, however, been great historians who, as we say, have made the past live for us. By some imaginative sympathy they have brought the vanished scene, and the long dead men, back so that we seem to live among them. The past is part of ourselves. It is conceivable that hereafter we might know it as we know the present, by experiencing it but with deeper understanding than we can ever have of the contemporary scene.

I conclude then with the proposition : If the knowledge which we have in the experience of knowing God is not illusion, it is the most complete kind of knowing and the type towards which all other kinds of knowing strive as towards their perfection.

UNATTACHED CHRISTIANS*

By the Rev. H. C. Snape

SAMUEL Butler says of the philosopher that he should have given up all, even Christ himself for Christ's sake. The company of philosophers who claim to have surrendered Christ for Christ's sake have become so numerous that their claim has come to be ignored both within and without the churches and regarded as an inevitable happening. This demands serious consideration from ecclesiastical leaders. For what it amounts to is this: 'We are attracted to the Christian faith as we find it expressed in the New Testament and in the lives of many Christians. But for one reason or another we find membership of a Christian Church to be a hindrance to the practice of loyalty to Christ as we understand that loyalty. We therefore claim that we are Christians, but unattached Christians.'

Both Victor Gollancz and Charles Péguy may be classified as unattached Christians. Victor Gollancz's autobiography written in the form of a letter to his grandson is exceptionally revealing and honest. For most autobiographies only reveal the portrait of the subject which he wants to give his readers. Gollancz makes every endeavour to be honest with himself and just to others. He even interposes into his narrative passages reflecting his mood and thoughts as he was writing, so that the reader can make allowances for the prejudices through which he sees his own past. He was born and brought up an orthodox Jew. I had almost written a Pharisee but this would have been incorrect. Gollancz is careful to explain that the minimum of legal observances had been laid down by a certain Joseph Caro in 1565 A.D. but that by 1900 much less was asked of a strict Jew. We are given a lively picture of all the scruples, observances, ritual and form which fettered and guarded the life of a Jewish household and came to a head in the observances of the annual Day of Atonement. The reactions of the young sensitive Gollancz to the commands and prohibitions of the Jewish law in the Gentile setting of London and St. Paul's school very much resemble those of the young Paul in the city and university of Tarsus. From his earliest years he seems to have found Judaism abhorrent on account of its thorough compulsiveness. 'If', he writes (p. 92), 'I had personified all the various prescriptions and prohibitions into a single living person and called it the Law, I should have described it as a sinning

*_My Dear Timothy_, by Victor Gollancz. (Victor Gollancz; 25/-.)
Charles Péguy, by Yvonne Servais. (Cork University Press; 25/-.)

person. 'What shall we say then', asked St. Paul. 'Is the law sin?' and replies, 'God forbid.' I should have replied 'Yes.' I am not sure that St. Paul does not himself imply something of the sort in other passages of the Epistle to the Romans. On the other hand he suggests what after all may be the only justification of formal religious training that the very ubiquity of religious customs and observances of his boyhood may have been the source of his own religious impulses and interests as they were manifested in manhood. The compulsive formalism of Judaism, however, failed to blind him to the intention of Judaism as a unique manifestation of the religious genius. As Gollancz himself shows, while he suffered the agonies which come to every youth who struggles against any compulsive and conventional spiritual environment, the quiet joy and large measure of freedom in secular activities which were also his derived from the very pattern of domestic life peculiar to Judaism.

As Gollancz passed from St. Paul's to New College, Oxford, he was also passing perhaps inevitably from orthodox Judaism to the worship of Christ. Judaism led to the Christian ethic; Platonism led to acceptance of the Incarnation, the spiritual resurrection, and even the Trinity. Abelard, introduced to him by Rashdall, taught him the moral doctrine of the atonement. 'I understood why, not knowing what the atonement was, I had yet known it to be a fact.' Of Hastings Rashdall he writes (p. 407):

> 'This was a stocky little man, oddly dark, and rather like Socrates, but uglier. I reverence his memory, as much for his opposition to befuddlements, an opposition of the sort people nowadays call woolly, as for his habit of unsparing consideration . . . At a time marked by cynicism on the one hand and neoism on the other, Abelard like Hastings Rashdall is doubtless out of fashion: but this will pass, along with the contemporary mania for honouring, particularly in writers, contempt for humanity and the spirit that denies.'

Under Rashdall's influence Gollancz contemplated baptism; arrangements were made, but at the last moment he declined. At that time, Gollancz writes, he disliked

> 'the church's dualistic other worldliness, its carrots and sticks, its punishments and rewards in the hereafter, its record in public affairs, its dogmatism, its corporate institutional self-righteousness and arrogance, its notion of hell, its recurrent crucifixion of Christ'.

He also felt that in becoming a Christian he would become a formal apostate from Judaism in the face of antisemitism.

The significance of Gollancz's ultimate refusal formally to declare himself a Christian by baptism may perhaps be clarified if it is compared with that of another Christian who refused to

identify himself with the Church, Charles Péguy, a French pamphleteer. Born of poor Catholic peasants he worked his way through the *Lycée* at Orleans to the *Ecole Normale* in Paris. There he was a student when the political and intellectual life of the capital was in the turmoil of the Dreyfus controversy. Péguy became an ardent Dreyfusite and an ardent socialist. He suffered his first disillusion when Dreyfus accepted pardon instead of continuing to defend his innocence and his socialist friends judged the case to be finished. His next disillusion came in 1902 when the radicals wreaked their vengeance on the Church by the anti-clerical legislation which suppressed 2,500 schools. Péguy discovered that anti-clericalism breeds intolerance no less than organized Catholicism. For the next twelve years Péguy was a lone prophet living on the verge of destitution and by means of a book-shop which appears to have been a *rendezvous* for impecunious literary folk. He found expression for his utterances in a fortnightly *cahier*. Péguy played a part in the literary life of Paris in the first decade of the century similar to that which Belloc and Chesterton played in London. Like Péguy, Belloc and Chesterton judged political parties in a parliamentary democracy to be only superficially devoted to the causes which they professed to champion, to be open to corruption and in reality to be united in a common resolve to maintain the parliamentary game. There were, however, these differences between them. On this side of the channel the Roman Catholic Church, because it embraced only a minority of the nation, seemed to be a purely spiritual institution, inheriting from the Middle Ages Christian ideals which to the romantic historian had in the age of chivalry been dynamic and would now bring new life to modern England. Hence, Belloc and Chesterton never lacked a haven and a response in their attacks on English Protestantism and parliamentary democracy from Catholics of both the Roman and Anglican variety. But Péguy was alone. Both the radical anti-clericals and the Catholic Church he found to be guided by superficial considerations of temporary political advantage. With keen spiritual sensitivity he saw the cries of social reform and the preservation of France as weapons for deceiving the electorate. The *débâcle* of 1940 would have been no surprise to him.

Human nature, as he experienced its workings in parliamentary democracy and modern society, failed him. He was attacked by his friends: the great socialist leader Jaurés whom he idolised betrayed the cause; the book-shop was in financial difficulties and the future of the *Cahiers* was in danger. He found the need of grace, but of grace with freedom.

> 'Grace', he wrote, 'is that royal army coming to the rescue. But it is also essential for man's freedom to make a rally and to go and meet this relieving army . . . . When Grace does not find freedom coming to meet her, neither does freedom find grace' (p. 305).

Like St. Joan, around whom in 1897 he had written a play, he became a Christian prophet who could not find shelter within the fold of the Church. He accepted the Christian faith but refused to the mystification of his Catholic friends and the author of his biography to submit to the Church's discipline and partake of the sacrament.

Both Victor Gollancz and Charles Péguy have proved themselves unattached Christians. A comparison of their lives may well show why Péguy remained a Catholic outside the Church. It also leaves us with certain unavoidable questions which only the future can answer, but on what answer the Catholic and Protestant Churches give, their future depends. Both Gollancz and Péguy in their youth were impelled by the juxta-position of wealth and destitution in a contracting world to champion the cause of socialism. Both became disillusioned as to the motives of any human society however honourable its professed intentions. Gollancz does not yet seem to have solved to his own satisfaction the problem of how to restrain evil and at the same time promote generosity and love. He was ready to become a professing Christian because all that he worshipped he found in Christ. But he found Christian institutions to be no different from any other human institutions save in the claims they made. Péguy's problem was more personal. Whereas Gollancz was successful in securing himself material comfort and the sympathy of friends, Péguy was poor and lonely; with the whole world against him he needed personal salvation. He found companionship and a cause to which he could give his life in military service in 1914. Like Gollancz, Péguy did not wish to cut himself off from his family who were radical atheists: like Gollancz too, Péguy could not swallow the traditional Christian teaching about hell. But the real reason for his refusal to become a faithful Catholic perhaps lies here. Péguy not only, as his Roman Catholic biographer suggests, did not want to cut himself off from his countrymen endangered by the modern world (p. 379). In his heart of hearts he could not accept the belief that assured salvation lay only within the church and that therefore the salvation of those outside the Church always lay in doubt.

Can the spirit of God only speak within the Churches? Does assured salvation lie only within the churches? If the kingdom of God is the reign of life in ever increasing depth and richness

and the Christ is the human and the divine in perfect harmony as found in Jesus co-operating to bring the Kingdom to its full realization, has the time not come for the churches to abate their claims to the crown rights of the kingdom? These are the kind of questions which the lives of such men as Gollancz and Péguy raise. They seek from the guardians of the Christian tradition what they should be able to give and are repelled by the terms on which their gifts are offered.

GOGUEL'S CRITICAL SURVEY OF CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

By C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D., Rector of Barfrestone

EVERY historian is concerned with three main themes: birth, life, and death. To everything there is a beginning, a duration, and an end; and every end ushers in a new beginning.

Dr. Maurice Goguel of Paris has devoted his life to the study of the beginnings of what is called in French '*Christianisme*' and in English either 'the Christian religion' or 'Christianity'. The substantial volume before me is the English translation of his *La Naissance du Christianisme*,[1] which itself is the second of a trilogy entitled *Jésus et les Origines du Christianisme*, of which the first part was *La Vie de Jésus*, the Engish translation of which appeared in 1933. The translation of the third part, *L'Eglise primitive*, may — I am informed — be expected in the course of a few years. In addition to these major works, Dr. Goguel has during the course of many years made detailed contributions to features and factors of this 'Naissance' in, among other journals, the *Revue de l'histoire des religions* (Paris) and the *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* (Strasbourg). The reader of the *Modern Churchman* will find translations of some of these detailed studies in the 1930 issues.

Professor Goguel has been a teacher in the Protestant Theological Faculty in Paris since 1905, where he holds the Chair in Exegesis and New Testament Criticism. The student of the movement of Christian thought during the last half-century may be here reminded of the significant fact — revealing much in many ways — that Goguel succeeded Loisy at *L'Ecole des Hautes Etudes* where, since 1927, he has been Director of Studies in Early

[1] *The Birth of Christianity*, by Maurice Goguel. Translated by H. C. Snape. (Allen & Unwin. 1953. 42/-.)

Christianity and the New Testament. '*Modernism is dead: Long live Modernism*' is a fitting comment on a history which encloses a Loisy and a Goguel, especially in a year that has seen the 'Canonization' of the anti-Modernist Pope — Pius X — who excommunicated both George Tyrrell and the Abbé Loisy. The latter's book on the same theme and with a similar title, *The Birth of the Christian Religion*, can instructively, to the student of Christian origins, be placed alongside this of Goguel's. For the present careful translation we are indebted to a member of the Modern Churchman's Union, H. C. Snape, Vicar of Whalley.

Both these books on Christian origins are characteristically French in their endeavours after clarity and precision of thought. They recall a long history of French erudition, both Catholic and Protestant (from the seventeenth-century Richard Simon to Maurice Goguel), devoted to a truly scientific investigation into the history, motivations and meaning of the books that compose the New Testament. Not yet, I think, has this French contribution been adequately appreciated in British Christian circles.

This present volume is a detailed analysis of the birth of the Christian faith as it came to expression at the end of the second century. Dr. Goguel thus defines his task:

> 'Anyone who had just seen Jesus die on the cross might well have thought that there was nothing left of him and his work except the memory of a splendid dream which hard reality had destroyed. Pilate would have been very much surprised if he had been told that his name would go down into history because he had pronounced sentence on a wretched little Jew who had been brought before him as an agitator and on the suspicion of being a danger to the rule of Rome. Yet in reality nothing was finished: something was going to begin which would march through the centuries and open up a new age in the history of mankind. A few souls had been so deeply impressed by the person and teaching of Jesus that, although the drama of Calvary was able temporarily to obscure that impression, it could not destroy it. Soon the disciples recovered their confidence in their master and their faith in his divine mission. Their hopes revived and they became convinced that Jesus had overcome death, and that henceforth he would sit on the right hand of God as the Lord in heaven. In this way a new faith was born. At first it found expression in a variety of forms which were gradually absorbed and assimilated into one system of doctrine. In its essential elements this process may be considered to have been completed by the end of the second century in the primitive catholicism of Irenaeus and Tertullian. It is the birth of this faith which I propose to analyse.'

Like all truly liberal Christian thinkers, Dr. Goguel has renounced the presuppositions that controlled traditionalist apologists both of Catholicism and of Protestantism. The 'infallibilities' are gone — save in decaying seminarist minds, systems, and institutions. No longer are miracles presented as the evidence of

faith and of the faith — that is, by any truthful historian. Christianity is viewed, in its birth and development, as every other body of thought and experience is viewed — as subject to the interior and exterior forces that determine all history. Miracle is not introduced to eke out the inadequacy and uncertainty of known forces. The apologetic flight to what Newman called 'the proof of the antecedent probability of miracles' is a flight that leads to intellectual, moral and spiritual disaster: what was called in a sermon broadcast over the wireless on the day of the Assumption (August 15, 1954) by Monsignor R. A. Knox 'a gesture against materialism' is seen to be a flight that ends in a materialism more impoverishing than its pretended or speculative opponent.

The severely scientific approach to the birth of Christianity raises, of course, problems. Yet this approach is now general, and indeed inescapable. Looking again the other day at F. C. Baur's *Church History of the First Three Centuries* (published in 1853), I was interested to read words that disturbed and threw into bitter confusion the traditional apologists of a hundred years ago.

> 'On what grounds', he asked, 'can we regard Christianity itself as a phenomenon purely supernatural, as an absolute miracle introduced into the world's history without the operation of any natural causes, and therefore incapable of being comprehended as belonging to any historical connection, when we find in every direction, wherever we turn, numerous points of connection and affinity in which it is linked with the most intimate bonds to the whole history of the development of mankind? It contains nothing that was not conditioned by a series of causes and effects going before.'

The fears and alarms caused by this basic approach are still with us, but are slowly yet surely being engulfed by the tides of history which sweep together, for good or ill, all the systems and institutions of mankind. It is our faith that this course, according to man's fidelity, is not without overruling meaning.

From this envisagement of basic considerations, let me turn to a few of Dr. Goguel's conclusions.

In part one he considers critically the birth of belief and faith in the resurrection of Jesus.

> 'The purpose of studying the stories of the resurrection must be to extract the factual elements on which faith depended, to outline the character of this faith, and to describe the psychological process which created it.'

Like most scientific critics Goguel has no confidence in 'the empty tomb'. He holds that the story is the result of the '*fonction fabulatrice*' which operated on the conviction that 'Christ was alive in heaven'. He does not consider the suggestion of a possible 'dematerialisation' of the earthly body of Jesus and, as I

understand him, has no confidence that the past, present and future findings of psychical research will vindicate or support the traditional belief. That, however, must be considered an issue *sub judice*, at least, in my own judgment.

On the resurrection appearances, Dr. Goguel writes:

> 'The faith in the resurrection originates from the appearances. All the other elements in the tradition are the fruit either of reflection or of an elaboration of the stories for purposes of apologetic or, as is most often the case, of both these factors.'

In part two, Dr. Goguel seeks to elucidate the historical situation in the Church of Jerusalem before and after 44 A.D. His main theme here is the failure of Christianity to develop in the framework of Judaism. On 'the mother of Jesus' he gives the evidence for the conclusion generally maintained by non-Catholic historians that the attribution of the *Magnificat* to Mary is 'a symptom of the growing importance attributed to her'. Those controlled by an infallible dogmatic system are not, of course, at liberty to say what they really think on such an issue.

> 'We have no reliable evidence that Mary was ever a member of the church and played any part in it. Attention was called to her by the appearance and development of the idea of the supernatural birth. At first she is represented as a purely passive instrument; then gradually, as Luke shows us, she became more like an active than a passive instrument because she of her own volition acquiesced in God's designs. Later on, when the idea of Mary's perpetual virginity sprang from that of the supernatural birth, she came to be considered not only the instrument of the incarnation but a collaborator in effecting it.'

The conclusion is: 'Christianity at Jerusalem was not interested in her'.

> 'Apart from certain surviving cults of feminine divinities the development of the cult of Mary was helped forward by a devotional need of popular piety for an object nearer and more accessible than God and Christ and for a being with the attribute of feminine and maternal tenderness who might be worshipped.'

In part three Dr. Goguel considers the development of Christianity within the framework of Hellenism and the beginnings of Christian doctrine. The chief historical figure here, of course, is Paul, and the main issue is the conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christianity — an issue of acute interest to the modern Christian who sees and foresees the inevitable merging of ideas and institutions in the era on which mankind is now launched.

Of this conflict Professor Goguel writes:

> 'Baur and his school exaggerated the importance of the conflict—but it is quite certain that in reacting from the exaggerations of the Tubingen school subsequent scholars have underestimated its significance.'

To-day there are evidences that Baur, no less than Schleiermacher, is coming back into the ranks of the prophets. The first is the historian who read the story of early Christianity in the light of the conflict between Peter and Paul, and made the tension between Petrinism and Paulinism the key to Christianity in the first two centuries. The latter is the theologian who dared to think that a God without man's experience of Him is a sham or a trick.

On the vital question of the relation of the work of Paul to that of Jesus, I must let Dr. Goguel speak for himself :

> 'We know that some historians (for example, Guignebert, in his last book *Le Christ*) have claimed that Paul was the second founder of Christianity and have thought his labours to have been as important as those of the first, if not more so. Yet this is to misunderstand his work. In the development of a religion we have to distinguish between devotion to a new religious object on the one hand, which is a real creative act, and on the other hand, the way in which this experience is expressed together with the organisation of a religious society without which it cannot be preserved in a settled condition. There is no doubt that without Paul, Christianity would never have become established in the form in which we find it. Perhaps it might have evaporated away, but with Paul and without Jesus it would never have been born.'

It is not possible to outline here, much less to discuss, Dr. Goguel's erudite and critical elucidations in parts four and five of the stabilization of Christianity and the reactions, both within Judaism and within the Roman Empire, to this solidification. The whole discussion is for the critical scholar rather than for the plain man. A few concluding reflections must close this review.

The work of the critical historian of early Christianity has gone on for the last few generations with patience and persistence. At the beginnings of this unceasing study the main obstacles to advance were dogmatic presuppositions inherited from the past and virtually imposed by Christianity's institutional embodiments. Many of these presuppositions remain active, but they become more and more sterile. This sterility, unfortunately, is paralleled by the aridity of the complex studies of the critical historians. The world waits for some work of comprehensive genius such as will combine scientific integrity and spiritual conviction.

THE PEJORATIVE USE OF 'IMMANENTIST'

By the Rev. F. H. Cleobury, Ph.D., author of *God, Man and the Absolute*.

THE Times of July 2, 1954, contained a letter commending *The Times* supplement on the Bible and containing the following passage:

> 'Many nineteenth-century scholars worked within the context of the liberal humanistic and immanentist thought of the time. The Old Testament was important, they declared, because it recorded the rise of ethical monotheism, because it was the literature of a people with a genius for religion. The gospels were important because they showed us (when stripped of accretions) one who was so perfectly human that he could be called divine.'

The letter goes on to declare that in this interpretation the authentic Word of God was not heard. In contrast with this, the writer continues, the now prevailing movement

> 'sees afresh that if the exposition of the Bible is to be true to the records themselves, man's religious experience cannot be placed in the centre of the picture. The Bible is the record of God's creative and redemptive activity, begun in the Old Israel, wrought out in Christ, and continued in the New Israel, the Church . . . Only within that context can the Bible be truly interpreted.'

Such statements as these—and they are, of course, quite common nowadays—seem to me to need much more comment and qualification than they usually get. I owe much to the liberal teachers of my youth; they prevented me and many of my generation from cutting loose from Christianity altogether. It is at least arguable that the reaction against religious liberalism was just the theological aspect of that general reaction against liberalism which gave us political totalitarianism in the forms of Bolshevism, Nazism and Fascism. It is surely no mere coincidence that the demand in some quarters for an authoritarian State should synchronize with a demand in others for an authoritarian Church or Bible. Older readers will remember the more or less explicit and plainly fallacious syllogism which clothed the fears and bias of many during and after the First World War: 'Germany is responsible for the War and the Belgian atrocities. Germany is the home of immanentist philosophies and of the higher criticism. Therefore the root causes of the world-disaster are immanentism and criticism.'

The emotional hostility against 'immanentism' developed into hostility to all idea of a Christian philosophy—indeed, in some quarters, hostility to philosophy altogether. Christianity must be based, we are now told, entirely upon history. And although it had to be conceded that not all the work of the critics

could be ignored, the new thesis was that in spite of all criticism the position of the Bible as 'the Word of God' remained entirely unaffected.

Now I am far from suggesting that there was nothing defective in the liberalism of my youth. But liberalism was not a school of closely integrated doctrine; it was an attitude of mind, and there were, of course, considerable differences between members of the movement. Some of them, but by no means all, were unduly optimistic about human nature, and their this-worldly emphasis justifies, in my view, recent insistence on the other-worldly and eschatological nature of the Christian faith. But I am by no means satisfied that some of the main contentions of those who have led the reaction are sound. I will try to indicate briefly my difficulties.

It seemed clear to the liberals that since it was no longer possible to regard every statement in the Bible as carrying Divine authority (for even the New Testament bears innumerable marks of the human limitations of the writers) the teaching of the Christian religion can no longer be merely a matter of the exposition of Scripture. They held that Biblical theology, and the dogmatic theology which leaned on it, would continue to be of great importance, but that the mere fact that, for instance, a certain doctrine is expounded in *Romans* does not settle its truth. If we decided that it was true, this was because it accorded with what we observed in men around us and because it carried a conviction to our hearts which we believed to be the work of the Spirit.

Now I am assured by some that all this is outmoded, and that in spite of the human element in Scripture—which, of course, they admit since they repudiate the label 'fundamentalist'—the Bible must be read as bearing an authority different from any other writing. I simply want to know why? It is no answer to say that without such an authority there can be no firm foundation for religion. For one thing, this is not true, and for another it would not prove the point at issue even if it *were* true. And if the answer is made that the Scripture carries its own credentials, and confronts us with an unmistakeable challenge from God, what is this but an appeal to inner experience? If any external authority, whether of Church or Book, is to be obeyed because it is revealed *as* such an authority by the Spirit, this clearly assimilates external to inner authority. And no one, surely, contends that *every* verse of the Bible confronts us in this way. We have to discriminate—presumably under the guidance of the Spirit. We may experience the Divine impact, the 'confrontation,' in reading *Romans* v and vi, but we surely do not feel it in reading (to take an example at random) *Mark* iv, 11-12. This strikes one as plainly unauthentic.

I simply cannot believe that Jesus told the parable of, for example, the Lost Sheep in order that the hearers should be mystified and *not* repent. (The passage is easily explained as due to the Paulinism of the writer of this Roman gospel; it bears the influence of Paul's doctrine of the hardening of Israel (*Romans* xi, 7, 8).) Or again, if I am confronted by God with the fact that justification is by faith alone, what about *James* ii, 24, which tells me that I can be saved by works as well?

In short, has any real alternative been provided to the liberals' thesis that the final seat of authority for the individual is his reason and conscience guided by the Spirit of God? Even if, under such guidance, a man comes to obey some command of the Church or to accept some Scriptural doctrine, it should be because he has a conviction of the rightness of the particular command or of the truth of the particular doctrine.

The truth is, the alleged contrast between a Christian philosophy and a Christian faith based on history has been oversimplified. If we have outgrown our schoolboy conception of history as something to be got out of a 'history book' and have realised that the study of history involves a close criticism of the contemporary and near-contemporary records of the period under survey, then we must be prepared—particularly when the period is as remote as the dawn of the Christian era—to find that the area of certainty is restricted, and surrounded by a vast area over which honest differences of opinion are possible. Can it be denied that this expectation has been abundantly fulfilled in the study of Christian origins? The prevailing theological mood of the last three decades has often expressed itself in generalisations about the 'discrediting' of the critics, but what scholar could declare as closed—let alone closed in the traditionalists' favour—such issues as form the subject of such recent works as Dr. Brandon's on the fall of Jerusalem and Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament?* Even Professor Dodd's recent work on the fourth Gospel must have given much food for thought to those who have been telling us that the *historical* character of that Gospel has been confirmed by recent criticism.

Generalisations about the discrediting of criticism often betray a fallacy—namely that the traditionalist view on any point at issue must be accepted unless a critic can prove conclusively that it is false. But in a realm where we can but balance probabilities, the critic is only required to show that an alternative to the tradition has a higher probability. Neither traditionalist nor critic has the right to announce a thesis and then throw on others the burden of disproof.

Now surely no one who has studied such works as the three I have just mentioned will deny that there is ground for honest difference of opinion over purely *historical* questions raised by a comparison between the synoptic, the Pauline and the Johannine writings. The one certainty is that under the guidance of the Spirit, Paul and the fourth evangelist were led to see in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus a supreme revelation of God, and that that same Spirit leads us to see it too. With this thought in mind, let me return to *The Times* letter. The liberals are charged with teaching that Jesus 'was so perfectly human that he could be called divine.' But it is not a matter of merely *calling* him divine; it is not a proposal to give a word an extended or unusual meaning. The question is 'In what sense can divinity be intelligibly predicated of one who was fully human?' Before we can assent to, or deny, a proposition we must attach a meaning to it. But most of the Anglican liberals wished most emphatically to affirm, not deny, the divinity of Jesus.

To be truly human involves human limitations; the concept of an omniscient and omnipotent human being is self-contradictory. The liberal 'immanentists' were trying honestly to find a background—a view of God and men and of their relationship—against which one could intelligibly predicate divinity of Jesus. If the common feature, the point of identity, is not omniscience or omnipotence, what *is* it?

One obvious task was to give metaphysical precision to the metaphor that man was made in the image of God. This led to the notion of that *formal* identity between every man and God in respect of man's rationality, including what Kant called the moral reason. When we are considering material objects we can say that they are exactly similar but not identical (e.g. two billiard balls). But when we are considering what is not extended, not 'in space', namely conscious being, this easy distinction between similarity and identity is not possible, and we are led to conceive that men, to the extent that they use aright their rational powers, including their moral reason, are in union or identity with God. This is 'immanentism.' But it is not pantheism; it is comparable with holding that there is that in human consciousness which is other than God, and that there is vastly much in God's awareness which is other than, or transcends, the awareness of men.

Now if identity between even the most perfect man and God cannot consist in omniscience or omnipotence, how *can* it be conceived? Surely only in moral and spiritual union or identity. It is easy to affirm that there is a vast difference between inspiration, union or identity on the one hand and incarnation on the

other, but I have yet to learn of an explanation of this difference which does not fall back on metaphor or myth.

Does such a view imply that the difference between Jesus and us is merely one of degree? If this only means that since he was fully human he was *of our kind* and therefore cannot differ from us *in kind*, this is not only true but tautologous. But to say of one who went to the cross in the belief that this was God's will for him as Messiah and Suffering Servant, and whose action has proved the greatest redemptive force in human history, that 'he was one of us,' and leave it at that, is to carry understatement to the point of absurdity.

Does immanentism necessarily disparage human personality; does it, for example, throw doubt on the Christian doctrine of the resurrection to eternal life of the full personality? Certainly not. The distinction between my life as an individual—the exclusiveness of my private memory-chain—on the one hand, and my life 'in God' on the other, is not a distinction between the present life and the hereafter, but a distinction which holds in my present earthly life. Even while we live on this earth it is true that 'in Him we live and move and have our being.' If, therefore, existence 'in God' is compatible with private self-consciousness, there is no reason whatever to imagine that the closer union with God to which we look forward in the world to come must involve loss of selfconsciousness. To lose that selfconsciousness which is an essential feature of the rational nature which distinguishes us from the animals and links us to God would be a strange salvation! Indeed, the very suggestion that a person can in some sense continue to be, and yet not be an individual, involves selfcontradiction.

Does liberal immanentism belittle sin? Our views on the sinfulness of human nature must base themselves on the observed facts around us. No one to-day will be unduly disposed to optimism. But the fact that man is very bad does not prove that once, on this earth, he must have been good or innocent. The view that man's revolt against God is due to the persistence and development in him of the ape and tiger, and failure to realise higher possibilities, cannot be dismissed unless it can be replaced by a theory which is truer to the observed facts and not based on myth or on some alleged external authority.

EVANGELICALS AT OXFORD, 1735—1871

By the Rev. Gamaliel Milner, M.A., author of *The Threshold of the Victorian Age*

'PROTESTANTISM is dying,' said a Jesuit preacher the other day. As long as we can remember we have been told Evangelicalism was at its last gasp. Like the Merry Monarch the Evangelicals take an unconscionable time a-dying.

The truth is, whether we like it or not, that since that memorable evening, May 24, 1738, about nine of the clock, just eighty-one years before Victoria's birth, when the Rev. J. Wesley, Lincoln College, Oxford, experienced the New Birth, Evangelicalism, or Methodism, has become the typical religion of the Englishman, nay of the Anglo-Saxon. It is defined by Mr. J. S. Reynolds, quoting Murray's English Dictionary, as

> 'the school of Protestantism which maintains that the essence of "the Gospel" consists in salvation by faith in the atoning death of Christ and denies that either good works or the Sacraments have any saving efficacy.'

Punch in the sixties depicts a lay preacher relating to the Vicar his ill-treatment at the hands of his brethren. 'I says to them, if this is the way you goes on, says I, I chucks religion and I goes to Church.' If the mourners at a funeral are permitted to choose the hymns, the prime favourites will be 'Rock of Ages' and 'Jesu, Lover of my soul.' They are happily unaware that Toplady, who wrote 'Rock of Ages,' called John Wesley a low and puny tadpole in divinity, actuated by Satanic shamelessness and Satanic guilt.

Evangelicalism is distinguished from ordinary Protestantism not so much by its doctrines as by its emotional appeal, its unction, which goes straight to the heart of the sentimental Briton. 'Whitefield,' said Garrick, 'could pronounce the word Mesopotamia in accents which would move you to tears.' Hume declared Whitefield the most ingenious preacher he had ever heard, and said it was worth going twenty miles to hear him. Whitefield was the fugleman of Methodism. The writer of this article repeats this with the more pleasure as he went to the same school as the great actor, and held the same scholarship at Pembroke College, Oxford. The 'hot air,' so to speak, was condensed by the great organizer, John Wesley, without whose aid it would probably have evaporated. Providence (we dare not say luck in such a connection) provided the Lincoln don with a brother who had a real lyrical gift, who could write hymns, a rare art. Music and song helped to captivate the English people just entering the Purgatory of Industrialism.

Lecky said that Methodism saved England from the horrors of the French Revolution; Lenin, borrowing the phrase from Charles Kingsley, called religion the opium of the people, it stupified them for the factory system. It is a remarkable fact that the campaign against opium preceded the Chinese Revolution. 'A giant is sleeping there; do not wake him,' said Napoleon. Opium and alcohol are useful narcotics;

> 'Beer does more than Milton can
> To justify the ways of God to man'

says Housman. And Methodism is, at lowest, a more respectable soporific than either.

Mr. Reynolds' book[1] is not, however, a history of Evangelicalism as a whole, but only as connected with its seed-plot, the University of Oxford. It began with the Holy Club or Bible Moths, a little group of undergraduates who had been influenced by Law's *Serious Call* (a curious name to give to one of the wittiest books in English). Law himself was not an Evangelical, and the so-called Methodists got their theology from the German Pietists, of whom the Moravians formed the left wing. Whitefield was converted in 1735, three years before Wesley, and his marvellous histrionic talents made him the talk of England. The necessity of a supernatural change, the certainty of eternal torture for all who died unconverted, these were not exactly new doctrines, but matters to be handled with gentlemanly reserve in the presence of persons of quality. 'God thinks twice before He damns anyone like the Duke,' said one of the courtiers of Louis XIV. The *Weekly Miscellany* reflected on the University of Oxford for letting the Methodists alone and permitting them to take degrees, which was giving them encouragement (p. 17). Warburton, the redoubtable Bishop of Gloucester, responded to the challenge; in his *Doctrine of Grace* he said that the Devil was man-midwife to the new birth. Lavington, Bishop of Exeter, instituted a comparison between the Methodist societies and the obscene rites of Paganism. Methodists, according to Lavington, were not merely Pagans but Papists. (See *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared.*) The parallel would probably be repudiated by both parties, but some neo-Catholic cults, the Devotions of the Sacred Heart and the like, have a certain resemblance to Methodism, or *vice versa*, which probably only proves that there is a good deal of human nature in man.

[1] *The Evangelicals at Oxford*, 1735–1871, by J. S. Reynolds, B.Litt., M.A. (Basil Blackwell, 1953; 25/-).

Mr. Reynolds complains of the persecution to which the early Evangelicals were subjected particularly by Low Churchmen, but an impartial observer will probably feel that both sides gave as good—or as bad—as they received. The Pagans who said, 'How these Christians love one another,' can hardly have been familiar with the controversial writings of Tertullian.

The martyrology of the Methodists at Oxford began with the expulsion in 1768 of six Evangelicals from St. Edmund's Hall, and as the blood of the martyrs is well known to be the seed of Christians, their type of thought became known as the Religion of Teddy Hall. The charges against the excluded were classified under four heads: 1, lack of breeding; 2, of knowledge; 3, indiscipline in hall; 4, ecclesiastical irregularity outside it. The case of a seventh man was dropped, since he was represented to be a man of fortune and not designed for Holy Orders. The exclusion made considerable noise and produced a flood of pamphlets. Whitefield informed the Vice-Chancellor that as some have been expelled for *extempore* praying, we hope that we shall hear of some few others of a contrary stamp being expelled for *extempore* swearing (pp. 36, etc.). Boswell asked the great Doctor if it were not hard to expel them, 'for I am told they were good beings.' The Sage, however, pronounced the expulsion entirely right and proper:

> 'They were not fit to be in the University of Oxford. A cow is a very good animal in the field, but we turn her out of a garden'.

The Evangelical publicists called loudly for action against the Latitudinarians; a certain witness against the Methodists was a candidate for Holy Orders 'while professedly holding infidel opinions' (p. 39). Even in the peaceful eighteenth century it might have been said, *Tantaene animis caelestibus irae?*

Before the end of his life Wesley took the two steps which virtually committed his followers to secession, the ordination of two Bishops to preside over the Wesleyan Methodists in the new independent country of the United States of America, and the foundation of a Conference, a body of Ministers in whom all the property of the Society was vested. Thirty years later the Calvinistic Methodists, whose stronghold was Wales, formally left the Church from which they had long been drifting away. Speaking broadly the rank and file of the Evangelicals became Dissenters, the upper and middle class remained Anglican.

That the Evangelicals survived in our Communion was mainly due to two men, Charles Simeon and William Wilberforce. The layman was particularly known as the advocate of the Abolition of the Slave Trade. But the Pontiff of the Clapham Sect, the

friend of Pitt, was the head of the Saints, an independent group in Parliament, who, sound Tories as they were, would always vote against the King and Minister if they thought a moral issue was at stake. 'Sincerely pious, without a trace of enthusiasm,' as the epitaph says, they financed missionary Societies and philanthropic work at home and proved that treasure in Heaven may co-exist with a substantial bank balance on earth. Simeon played a part in the Evangelical Party like that of Pusey with the Tractarians after Newman's secession; he picked up the fragments that remained of the Methodists and persuaded his friends to use their well-earned wealth to buy up advowsons.

Mr. Reynolds shows that Balleine goes too far when he says that the Evangelicals foiled at Oxford turned to Cambridge. Horace Walpole had written, 'Oxford has begun with the rascals, I hope Cambridge will wake up.' But the French Revolution opened men's eyes to the need for religion, at any rate for the labouring classes; morality, nay property, was in danger.

> 'Towards the end of the (eighteenth) century, Oxford again became open to Evangelicals, and St. Edmund's Hall under Crouch and Daniel Wilson resumed its work of training those who were hoping to take Holy Orders' (p. 58).

The *Christian Observer* does not hesitate (p. 59) to compare Isaac Crouch with Charles Simeon. It was the period of the great Societies; the C.M.S. was founded in 1799 with Josiah Pratt of the Hall as its first Secretary. Daniel Wilson became the first Anglican Metropolitan of India. Nor did the Evangelicals want adherents among the aristocracy, Nicholas Vansittart, whose portrait, reproduced on p. 65, hangs at Christ Church, a not very distinguished Chancellor of the Exchequer and for seventeen years President of the British and Foreign Bible Society in the days when it sent Borrow to Spain, and Lord Blandford, afterwards Duke of Marlborough and ancestor of Sir Winston Churchill.

In the spacious times of great Victoria the Evangelical Churchmen became quite respectable. There was indeed an unbalanced fringe, a protestant underworld, who gave way to apocalyptic and other fancies, men like Francis Newman, Fellow of Balliol, brother of J. H. Newman, who became first a Darbyite, *alias* a Plymouth Brother, afterwards 'lapsed into infidelity' (p. 96), and finally provoked Matthew Arnold to write his famous *Essay on Translating Homer*. But such cases were exceptional. The Evangelicals lived on friendly terms with the Broad Churchmen, the Arnoldians, as they were commonly called. Robertson of Brighton, of whom there is an interesting account in the

December issue of the *Modern Churchman*, was an outstanding example of the fusion of the two elements. Not till Colenso let the cat out of the bag did the gentleman's agreement come to an end. That dreadful man, Colenso, a Cornishman we regret to say, had an unholy taste for arithmetic and a Zulu friend who would ask inconvenient questions about the Flood and had no Dr. Malan to keep him in order. The Bishop of Natal, the unhappy Colenso, as Liddon called him, had no sense of reticence. We have talked to old people who as children had serious doubts whether they ought not to become conscientious objectors to working sums out of his Arithmetic. Then there came *Essays and Reviews*, written by the *Septem contra Christum* (one of them died Archbishop of Canterbury). With Darwin's *Descent of Man* all the fat was in the fire, but our author prudently closes his book in 1870.

Evangelicalism had become not only respectable, but even fashionable. This was due to Palmerston. He had married as her second husband Lord Shaftesbury's mother-in-law. The philanthropist was at first apprehensive. 'I much fear,' he wrote in 1855, 'that Palmerston's ecclesiastical appointments will be detestable. He does not know, in theology, Moses from Sydney Smith.' But it turned out that Palmerston recognized his limitations in this direction (p. 133). It was not unnatural that he should turn for assistance to his pious relative. For nine years Shaftesbury was known as the Bishop-maker. 'Ever do any translating, Pam?' Derby who had just published a version of the *Iliad* is represented as saying to his rival. 'No! I leave all that to Shaftesbury.' Quite a respectable array of Evangelical Bishops appeared on the Bench. Not till the Premiership alternated between Gladstone and Salisbury did the High Churchmen recover their predominance.

Mr. Reynold's book is, perhaps, rather a book of reference, a necessary addition to every ecclesiastical library, than a book for light reading. It is particularly strong on the biographical side and fills many gaps. For example we learn that Connington, the standard translator of Virgil and Corpus Professor of Latin, having in early life been an infidel was 'strikingly converted by God' (p. 130). Sir Monier Williams, Boden Professor of Sanskrit, who has left his memorial at Oxford in the Indian Institute, was a Christian man of definitely Evangelical principles. It is pleasant to read of our old friend Canon Christopher of St. Aldate's and his missionary breakfasts in the Town Hall. No, Evangelicalism is not dead and will probably last as long as the English Tradition. The Liberal Evangelical seems to be a fertile hybrid capable of producing both flowers and fruit.

PROFESSOR DUPONT SOMMER ON THE DISCOVERIES BY THE DEAD SEA*

By the Rev. H. F. D. Sparks, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of the Holy Scripture, Oxford.

THIS book is a sequel to the author's *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*, published in 1952 and reviewed in *The Modern Churchman* in December of that year (Vol. xlii, No. 4, pp. 334 ff.).

Since the earlier book was written a very great deal has happened. A series of buildings in the neighbourhood of the cave where the original manuscripts were discovered in 1947 has been excavated: other caves nearby have been found to contain an almost unimaginable wealth of manuscript material, though mostly (it seems) fragmentary; and the so-called 'Manual of Discipline,' a document of cardinal importance for the understanding of the religious tenets and associations of the group to which the manuscripts belonged, has been published in full and edited by the Americans, to whom we owed already the excellent edition of the 'Isaiah A' scroll and the Habakkuk Commentary. From Professor Dupont-Sommer's point of view the publication of the 'Manual' must be regarded as the outstanding event, since in his previous work he was forced to rely on specimen photographic facsimiles which covered scarcely a fifth of the whole manuscript. Accordingly, in the present work he reviews his previous conclusions in the light of the most up-to-date evidence available.

The conclusions remain the same, though, as was only to be expected, they have been much amplified. The argument, if systematized, may be stated as follows: (1) the excavation of the buildings reveals a settlement of considerable size, and from the disposition and contents of the buildings themselves it would appear that they are the remains of a monastery: (2) the jars in use in the monastery are exactly similar to the jars used to contain the manuscripts found in the caves, while a pupil's 'A.B.C.' from the monastery's scriptorium shows a script identical with that of the manuscripts—there can be no doubt, therefore, that the manuscripts in the caves came from the monastery, that they are in fact the remains of the monastery library, and they were probably hidden where they were found for safety at a time of

* *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls.* By A. Dupont-Sommer: translated from the French by R. D. Barnett (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co. Ltd., 1954; pp. xii and 195; 10/6d. net).

crisis just before the monastery itself was destroyed: (3) such coins as have so far been recovered from the site, and catalogued, range in date (with a few unimportant exceptions) from the time of John Hyrcanus to that of the latest Roman procurators—this means that the monastery was first occupied about 100 B.C. and destroyed about A.D. 70, i.e. the 'time of crisis' was the Jewish War of A.D. 66-70: (4) a study of the buildings (notably the arrangements in use for feeding and the provision of no less than three 'swimming pools'), when compared with the statements of Philo, Pliny, and Josephus, suggests that the community which inhabited the monastery was a community of Essenes; and (5) this suggestion is fully confirmed by the character of those documents from the caves (especially the 'Manual'), which are most naturally explained as the peculiar writings of a particular religious sect.

Professor Dupont-Sommer, however, does not argue to his conclusions. He assumes them, and then illustrates and comments. Thus, his first chapter is boldly headed 'The Remains of the Essene Monastery.' Next, in 'The Kittim of the Habakkuk Commentary,' he criticizes the arguments of those who identify the Kittim in the Commentary with the Seleucids: the Kittim for him (as in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*) are the Romans. In 'The Testament of Levi and the Teacher of Righteousness' he claims that *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are an Essene production, and the celebrated chapters *T. Levi* xvii and xviii are explained in the light of this hypothesis: the 'New Priest' in *T. Levi* is the Teacher of Righteousness, who after his ignominious death has been translated to heaven, and, invested with full Messianic glory and enthroned as 'Saviour of the World', has become for the members of the Community of the Covenant which he had created (or rather re-created) the essential object of their faith. Then, in 'The Manual of Discipline and the Community of the Covenant', 'Rules and Rites of the Community of the Covenant', 'The Holy Season', 'The Doctrine of the Two Spirits', and 'Mystical and Moral Ideals', Professor Dupont-Sommer outlines the beliefs and practices of the Community, emphasizing (notably in 'The Doctrine of the Two Spirits') the indications of non-Jewish formative influences — particularly Zoroastrianism. And finally, in 'The Community of the Covenant and the Origins of Christianity', he compares Essenism, the Baptist Movement, and Christianity, and ends by quoting the saying of Renan:

> 'Nothing developed in Christiantity which had not its roots in Judaism of the first and second century B.C.'

In all this there is much that is illuminating and little that is not ingenious. But ingenuity can never be a satisfactory substitute for solid fact and cogent argument. Professor Dupont-Sommer may well be right in his main contention that the Qumran settlement was an Essene monastery, that many of the books found in the caves were produced by Essenes, and that we can use them as evidence for the inner life of Essenism. Yet it should be clearly understood that at the present stage of investigation even this fundamental point is nothing more than a reasonable conjecture. There is almost certainly much more in the Qumran area still awaiting discovery: the particulars of what has been discovered already are at present, necessarily, very often so meagre that they might just as well not exist so far as their use for valid inference is concerned; while only a tiny fraction of the mass of manuscript material has as yet been published. It may, or may not, therefore, be significant that up till now no mention of Essenes by name in the material has come to light. It is, however, sobering to set alongside Professor Dupont-Sommer's all too easily assimilated total picture the judgements of other scholars, who are equally anxious for a solution to the problems, and are in many cases equally learned. Thus, whereas Professor Dupont-Sommer uses the so-called 'Damascus Document' or 'Zadokite Fragments', found in the Cairo Genizah at the end of the last century, as evidence together with the manuscripts found in the caves without any discussion whatever of their mutual relationship, Dr. Rabin, the latest editor of the Damascus Document, writes, 'It is, in my opinion, much too early to come to any conclusions about the date of the Documents or their relation to other known movements or writings' (C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, Clarendon Press, 1954, p. ix). No doubt such a statement as Dr. Rabin's may legitimately be stigmatized as over-cautious. But to quote it may serve to point the contrast beween two extremes; for, if Dr. Rabin represents one extreme, Professor Dupont-Sommer unquestionably represents the other. In other words, there are at present no 'facts' in this matter save the remains of the monastery(?) building and of the library which once it housed. All else, as yet, is theory.

Of Professor Dupont-Sommer's method of argument (where there is any argument) one example must suffice. In the neighbourhood of the Qumran settlement there is a vast cemetery containing upwards of a thousand graves. So far only nineteen of them have been opened; and of the nine skeletons scientifically examined 'several' (so Father de Vaux in *Revue Biblique*, lx [1953], p. 103) have proved to be those of women. Professor Dupont-

Sommer realises that if, as he supposes, the cemetery was the last resting place of members of the local Essene community this piece of archaeological evidence very definitely conflicts with the testimony of the ancient authors, all of whom agree in stating that the Essenes disdained marriage. To begin with, he refers to 'some' female skeletons among the nineteen. He then deals with the substantive difficulty as follows:

> 'It may be noted that the presence of women in this cemetery does not in any way form an objection to the Essene theory. It is true that the passage of Pliny the Elder in the first century A.D. proves that the Essenes of the Dead Sea Monastery lived in strict celibacy; *sine ulla femina, omni venere abdicata*. But previously, for example in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, the Essenes living there may well have had their families with them. In the Damascus Document (viii. 6-9) and also in the unpublished fragments of the *Manual of Discipline* there are clear references to members of the sect marrying, to women, and to children. Further, Josephus mentions that even in his time there existed married Essenes. These married Essenes were only continuing the ancient customs. Above all, even after the Essenes of Qumran had adopted the rule of celibacy, nothing prevents us allowing that some pious woman may have been admitted exceptionally to sleep her last sleep in the cemetery of the saintly ascetics' (p. 171).

Careful readers of this defence may in their turn note: (1) that the picture of Essenes living at Qumran with their families in the time of Alexander Jannaeus represents nothing save Professor Dupont-Sommer's own vivid imagination: (2) that the references to the Damascus Document and the 'unpublished(!) fragments' of the Manual of Discipline are an excellent illustration of an argument in a circle—these documents can only be evidence that Essenes married if they are indubitably Essene productions: (3) that the passage in Josephus (*Jewish War* II. 160, 161) does not just 'mention that there existed even in his time married Essenes', it states explicitly 'there is yet another order of Essenes, which while at one with the rest in its mode of life, customs, and regulations, differs from them in its views on marriage'—in other words, there was a schismatic sect of Essenes—is it likely that this sect inhabited what Professor Dupont-Sommer regards as 'possibly' the 'main' Essene monastery?: and (4) that even if we grant that an occasional pious lady may have been 'exceptionally' allotted a plot in the graveyard of the Community, 'several' female skeletons out of a total of nine examined is an uncommonly high proportion for the exceptional. No. If we must have an Essene theory, far better suppose either that burial in the cemetery was in no way restricted to members of the Community, or that, if it was, that the monastery at Qumran was the centre of the schismatic 'order' mentioned by Josephus, and

that Pliny was confused or misinformed; or, better still, admit honestly that in the existing state of knowledge the contents of the cemetery do in fact constitute a very serious 'objection to the Essene theory'—an objection which may or may not be removed by subsquent excavation (which might prove, for example, that all of the mere handful of graves so far opened belong to a special extra-monastic 'corner').

There are, of course, a number of other points which might be taken up. Professor Dupont-Sommer, for instance, ascribes not only *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to the Essenes: *Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and *The Psalms of Solomon* are also Essene productions, as well as *Ecclesiasticus* in its present form, and even the *Wisdom of Solomon* has Essene affinities: might one not go on and add *Isaiah*, *I Samuel*, and *Genesis*, for these books too either were found in the caves or have affinities with those that were? Again, the Index of Hebrew words at the end (apparently compiled by the translator, since it is lacking in the French original) is a most curious compilation: it is far more notable for what it omits than for what it includes: it starts with '*Am*, which is followed by *Anshe*, and neatly sandwiched between '*RB* and *Serek* is the incorrigibly Latin *Scriptorium*: one wonders with just how much care the book as a whole was put together.

But, details apart, what is the value of the book for the general reader? Without question there is a serious danger that the inherent fascination of the subject-matter, reinforced by the author's vigorous and appealing style, may lead such a reader to think that here is a straightforward, authoritative, and widely accepted solution, not only to the problems raised by the Qumran discoveries in themselves, but also to many other, more long-standing and obstinate, problems in the field of Christian origins. To do him justice, Professor Dupont-Sommer gives no countenance to such an idea. He describes his book as 'only a brief summary' and continues:

> 'No one is more conscious than I of the difficulty and complexity of the problems. If I present my view clearly and without ambiguity, it is in order that everyone may be able to grasp it exactly and, where necessary, to criticise it to the best of his knowledge and ability . . . It it obvious that we are only at the beginning of a tremendous task of research' (p. xi).

Nor will he be a party to explaining everything Christian as a borrowing from the Essenes:

> 'Christianity is not Essenism, any more than Essenism is Christianity, or Christianity in anticipation. I, for my part, have never used any such formula, which would be an over-simplification of the problem . . . However important the borrowings may be which Christianity was able

> to make from Essenism properly speaking, Christianity is no copy or replica of Essenism. It is, to put it more exactly, a *quasi*-Essene neo-formation, the originality of which I am far from denying. It has no direct affiliations; as a neo-formation, it contains too much that is new to be considered as a repetition pure and simple. Christianity, I repeat, is not Essenism' (p. 150).

Yet in spite of these disclaimers the danger remains that the very 'clarity' and 'freedom from ambiguity' with which the thesis is presented may prove a snare for the unwary. Once again, it may well be that Professor Dupont-Sommer has found the key which will unlock the secrets of Qumran; but, also once again, it may well be that he has not. In either case, however, the discoveries are of front-rank importance. And important as they obviously are for the study of Christian origins, they are likely to prove ultimately far more important for the study of the history of the Old Testament text—an aspect of the subject with which Professor Dupont-Sommer, perhaps wisely, makes no attempt to deal.

LIBERALISM AGAINST THE STREAM*

By the Rev. C. O. Rhodes

(Editor of *The Church of England Newspaper,* Director and Secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union)

IN these days there are many who would, if they were able, entrap us again in the yoke of bondage to legalism, to superstition, to tradition and to fear. They desire our submission to the forces which St. Paul described as 'the weak and beggarly elements.' In the next verse following our text, the Apostle warns us that if we fall into submission, Christ shall profit us nothing.

Do we then as liberals in religion make the arrogant claim to be more truly in the apostolic succession than others? We reply that the claim is not arrogant since we exalt ourselves over nobody but work for the emancipation of all. And we do, indeed, make precisely that claim because the theme of liberty recurs incessantly throughout Holy Scripture. Nobody can quote Scripture so powerfully in his support as the liberal.

For two reasons liberalism has recently lived under a cloud in spite of the fact. First, it is said that liberalism has shot its bolt and has nothing more to do. In this place we are thinking more particularly of the liberal movement in the Church of England and, in just acknowledgement of an older generation of liberals, we must admit that they have several glowing achievements to their credit. That does not mean that their work is finished. Liberalism will never have shot its bolt but must, in loyalty to its spirit, constantly subject the contemporary world and the contemporary Church to criticism by its permanent standards. The character of its operations may change but its mission will never be completed.

Authority of the Bible

What, then, are the great achievements of the past? I would indicate two. Perhaps the more important of them has been, by establishing the principle of Biblical criticism once and for all, to direct men's attention again to the Third Person of the Trinity. Even in the most conservative circles Biblical criticism is accepted as a valid approach to the Scriptures. Since the idolatry of the book is undermined, it can no longer dispute rights with the Holy Spirit.

* The annual sermon of the Modern Churchmen's Union preached at St. Martin-in-the-Fields on May 26, 1954.

Galations, chap. v, verse 1: Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

As a consequence theologians, especially as they are trying to recover the deeper meaning of the Bible, are hard pressed to define adequately its authority. To the question liberalism raised they have not found a clear and decisive answer. This question they never will be able to answer if it is wrongly stated. What people too often look for is a facile authoritarianism and the answer of the theologian can only be that the search is misdirected.

Other principles for which liberals have contended are embodied in the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine, published in 1938. However theological fashions may change, this Report remains as a warrant that liberalism fulfils its function within the Church as of right. Its importance does not rest so much in its recognition that this or that opinion is compatible with churchmanship, although in some instances that recognition is a necessary safeguard, as in its tacit acceptance of the right of the Christian mind to range freely over a very wide field.

These two victories, that relating to Biblical critcism and that marked by the Report on doctrine, are important not only for their own sake but also because they both provide a foundation for future work and set liberalism free for other tasks. Liberalism will always be at war with obscurantism in one quarter or another but is no longer fighting for its right to a place in the Church at all. That battle, at least, is won. We can now consider on their merits, without constricting presuppositions and without any *arrière pensée*, the new maps of the spiritual world which are presented to us, whether by a Bultmann, or a C. G. Jung, or whoever else.

Loss of Faith

If, however, we need have no fear that liberalism has shot its bolt and should undergo a voluntary euthanasia, the other shadows that lie over it in these days are less easily dispelled. Those of us who were cut off from the main tendencies within the Church during the war were amazed on our return to observe how the whole atmosphere had changed in the meanwhile. Instead of being the symbol of advance, the word 'liberal' had become a term of reproach.

There was a falling-back upon time-worn orthodoxies. The horrors witnessed during the preceding years seemed to have discredited the whole human race, and with it all that liberalism stood for. Those theologies gained ground which were most contemptuous of man. In some circles it was enough to mutter the phrase 'original sin' to explain all the perplexities and all the

sufferings that beset mankind and to excuse ourselves from any concern with them.

Men were to put their faith in God, not so much because of a lively conviction and a consciousness of His demand upon them, as because faith in God was better than nothing. While men who talked like this imagined that they were exalting God's majesty, they were in fact succumbing to the secular mood of disillusion and introducing into the Church the nihilism of the contemporary world. It is wise to remember the law of unequal development and avoid over-much generalisation; but it seemed often as if even those who maintained their loyalty to liberal organisations had lost confidence in their own mission and no longer believed in themselves.

As time went on the general public seemed to be settling down and there was an altogether happier atmosphere. And it is as well, in passing judgement on the multitudes of our countrymen, as ecclesiastics are so prone to do, to recollect the shattering series of shocks and adjustments they have had to endure during the past forty years. In this recollection we can only be amazed at the steadiness they have shown. There are limits to endurance and if breakdowns begin to occur here and there it is both unkind and unjust to write with an easy flourish as if our people had abandoned all decency and all regard for what is right.

False Security

In that situation, with men and women everywhere fearful of what evils might befall them at any moment, day by day the breakdown of statesmanship becoming more and more evident, there comes news of new inventions which increase many times over the menaces that threaten peace and security. Prophecy of the future would require the imagery of a William Blake. From the overweening confidence in their own power to shape events, the leaders of the people have suddenly regressed into a condition where they know themselves to be at the mercy of forces beyond control.

Such a state of affairs cannot fail profoundly to influence the religious outlook of the people involved in it. How people will react in any situation is never a foregone conclusion; but it would be unprecedented if at a time like the present they moved in a liberal direction. Expectation is all to the contrary. The urge driving them on will be the need of security and, in the manner of men, they will take the path of least resistance. They will turn for security to authoritarian systems; they will huddle together in dedication to comforting superstitions; they will heed any claim

of infallibility that shouts loudly enough; they will try to restore the fallen gods of biblical literalism and priestly authority. Perhaps they will even try to hide from reality by choking the channels of thought and information. They will go in their thousands after popular leaders peddling religious or political nostrums. They will immure themselves in arks of refuge which they hope will protect them from all storms. Or else they will fall into apathy.

A Positive Message

It will be the hard task of liberalism to attack these illusions. It will have to insist, in season and out of season, that infallibilities do not exist on this earth and that the search for them is vain. It will have to demonstrate that the securities men find are false and will let them down in the end.

That does not mean that liberalism must become a sour and negative attitude. On the contrary: this work of criticism and destruction must be simultaneous with the proclamation of positive and saving truth. Valid security is neither in what we believe nor in the institutions to which we belong. It consists in the integration of the personality in relationship with God in Christ.

That is the message which, in the various situations it has confronted, the liberal movement has always been conveying to the Church of England. The bondage which men so willingly accept, whether to forms of words or legal systems or ecclesiastical hierarchies, is stultifying to the spiritual life. It provides no security in the day of testing. In the end, men will find true security if they take the risk of breaking away from these anchorages which can, indeed, hold them back from finding union with the deeper origins of their spiritual being. The spiritual *malaise* of the present day is not due to any lack of institutions to which people can belong Of these there are too many. Their weakness results rather from their isolation from the only relationship which can give stability and strength. They are afraid of launching out, afraid of their freedom and dare not, like the old sailing ships, leave the roadsteads to ride out the storms on the open sea, which is their natural element.

If liberals are to maintain an effective witness to these truths they must rigorously observe certain principles.

Realistic Theology

First, they must do their theological thinking, as all theological thinking ought to be done, in relation to the whole contemporary situation. Theology should not try to deal with men in the abstract.

If it does, it may succeed in gaining a momentary popularity, but future generations will have to clear up the confusion left behind. Perhaps we may take note of the lessons of another intellectual discipline—economics. The classical economists dealt with man in the abstract, 'economic man,' who never did and never could exist. The conclusions they reached exerted great influence because the leaders of society at the time wanted to treat their countrymen as the bloodless and unfeeling creatures the economists had devised for purposes of their intellectual convenience. But only a herculean effort of mind and will has overcome the wretchedness they left behind.

Theology easily falls into the same error and the text-books of moral theology, in particular, are rank with it. An outstanding example is troubling us at the moment. I refer to the Church's thought about divorce and remarriage at the present time and to the controversy now in progress as to the Church's attitude. We ought not to work out problems such as this in isolation from society as it now is. The atmosphere of the monkish cell, or even of the university library, is not the right one for seeking an answer—and it is remarkable how some people manage to maintain that kind of detachment wherever they go. Nor can we deal with a problem such as this in a mood of nostalgia for some golden age of marriage whether it be that of mid-Victorianism or even of the early Church.

We are not thinking about some kind of abstract 'theological man' but of human beings of flesh and blood living in the very difficult circumstances of 1954. A society which had within it hundreds of thousands of normally sexed men and women—it may be millions—forbidden to establish a satisfactory relationship would be heading for disaster. But theologians of some schools tell these people it is a sin to establish a proper relationship and would virtually cut them off from the spiritual ministrations of the Church if they do.

It is fortunate that the State has not followed the Church in this matter, but we cannot always expect the State to save the nation from the blunders of the Church. The present compromise is only a second best. The stand certain sections are taking with regard to this problem is quite fantastic. Theology which would lead to moral anarchy cannot be true. The fallacy at the root of the present mistaken attitude is the assumption that it is possible to make laws of human conduct which will be valid universally and at all periods of history, the assumption that the conditions of human relationship remain always the same.

Convergence of Evils

This is a particularly good example of the principle that we should not do our theological thinking in the abstract but as people involved in a historical situation. It is a good example because as soon as we begin to think about the reasons for the breakdown of the family we find our minds carried far afield. So many of the evils of our times, evils arising out of industry, the structure of our towns, our educational system, our Press, our entertainments, our means of communication and our ideological confusion, seem to converge at this point. It is absurd and cruel to treat the couple finding the way to the divorce courts as if they were an isolated phenomenon, two people who had consciously abandoned themselves to sin in rebellion against God. The maladjustment of their personalities is a tragic reflection of the corruption at the heart of society—but only a reflection. It is not causative. It is a symptom.

Think along these lines and we shall soon find that theology is merging into philosophy, sociology, economics, politics and psychology—all those enquiries which take the human personality, its nature and relationships, as their province. Theology will interpret and unify these disciplines; it will become the trunk of the tree of which these are the branches. And the liberal, with his freedom from cramping presuppositions, is better fitted than anybody else for the task. As it happens, the work has hardly begun and theology, instead of being a leaven influencing all thought about human affairs, tends to be one body of thought lying alongside a number of others without affecting them at all—like in a graveyard. Individuals and scattered groups are pioneering here and there, but still even among intellectual people, it is regarded as strange and incongruous when theologians try to speak intelligently on these matters.

Yet theology in this respect parallels the position of the Church itself in society; and this brings me to the second great task of liberalism. The Church has for years been tending more and more to be one compact, self-contained institution side by side with others such as industry, democracy, medicine and education. Again, it would be a mistake to generalize too much, and we may note with especial satisfaction the friendlier relationship coming into existence between the Church and the medical profession. Tentative approaches are being made in other directions, too. But one swallow does not make a summer and, as churchmen, we are very prone to premature rejoicing. The fact remains that the Church is no longer identified with the spiritual outreachings of the people.

Truth is that the circumstances of the time are compelling the Church to become heavily over-institutionalised. This seems to be an inevitable reaction to the financial and administrative problems that are weighing us down. The ablest Christian minds are immersed in the internal affairs of the Church instead of looking outward. To criticise our leaders for surrendering to this need is tempting, but not very constructive and hardly fair. It is more helpful to look for a solution to an intractable problem. Unfortunately, doctrines of the Church which are now popular in some quarters encourage this collectivisation and separation instead of relieving it. Once again secular tendencies are invading the Church and liberals should be working in the opposite direction.

Hope of Redemption

Liberalism's third great task is to restore confidence in human potentiality. It may be true that liberals in the past indulged in a great deal of flimsy idealism and shoddy optimism. That idealism and that optimism have worn thin now. But we can be sure of this; that where faith in man goes, faith in the love of God and His concern for the salvation of all men will soon follow. God will be to us so remote and transcendent as to be beyond our caring. Indeed, we may go so far as to say that the one is, in the deepest sense, a correlate of the other. To say this does not in the least degree imply an understimate of the gravity of sin and it is sheer nonsense to suggest it does. We are all the more conscious of the tragedy of sin because of our awareness of the potential nobility of the sinner.

But it is a good principle to act upon, even if not universally true, that men do not, as a rule, propose evil to themselves as a desirable objective. Sin comes in with its deceptions to distort and pervert, sometimes in the most horrible and grotesque ways what began as a right intention. Behind much of the world's evil, if we look for it, there is a positive element. It is this that the living Christ seeks out when working for the redemption of men. It is on this that we ourselves should concentrate. But if we share the contempt for man that is the fashion in some quarters we open the door at once to all the wickednesses which oppress and degrade him.

We shall be more in the mind of Christ if we think of man as sufferer rather than sinner. We read of Him that He had compassion on the multitudes. He dealt with man's guilt in order to remove his suffering. He rescued a woman from her persecutors before He told her to sin no more.

This is not such a popular doctrine in these days as once it was. In its heyday the liberal movement in the Church of England was in harmony with the intellectual climate of the nation. It is doubtful whether that is any longer true. The weak and beggarly elements of which St. Paul spoke are having their chance again. But that is not a reason for departing from our liberal heritage. It may be a reason for consciously working against the stream. Let us ' stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.'

IN MEMORIAM

RICHARD HENRY CHILLINGWORTH (1873—1954)

THE membership of the Modern Churchmen's Union includes a number of notable Irish Churchmen. Among them was Richard Henry Chillingworth, whose death has occurred at his home in Dublin. He will be much missed at our Modern Churchmen's Conferences, where he was a regular attendant. He was essentially an educationist, and it was this which attracted him to our educational society.

Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he spent some years in Germany engaged in the study of the German language and literature. On his return to Ireland he entered the teaching profession and became an authority on Irish education. *The Times* in its obituary notice of him testifies to his eminence as an educational publicist :

> He was a distinguished educationist and writer, who for 25 years wrote the Irish column for *The Times Educational Supplement*. He was also a contributior to the *Irish Times* and wrote for many literary and Church magazines. A book of his essays was published some years ago entitled *Impressions and Prejudices*. For some years he wrote the chapter on Irish education for the *Year Book of Education*, published by London University.

The *Modern Churchman* is indebted to him for valued contributions, the latest of which records the recent Trinity College Commemoration of the abiding influence of his fellow-countryman, Bishop Berkeley, published in this issue.

To students of English Church history, the name Chillingworth prompts the question : was Richard Henry Chillingworth a descendant of the seventeenth-century Oxonian ecclesiastic, William Chillingworth, to whom we owe the *dictum* : ' The Bible and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants '?

Richard Henry was not a lineal descendant but a collateral.

H.D.A.M.

MARY RUTH LLOYD LLOYD-BAKER (1874—1954)

The Modern Churchmen's Union has also recently lost a very old and faithful member by the death of Miss Lloyd-Baker, recorded in *The Times* of November 13 :

> LLOYD-BAKER.—On November 10, 1954, at Buckle House, Uley, Dursley, Glos., Mary Ruth Lloyd Lloyd-Baker, aged 80, late of Hardwicke. Cremation private. Service and interment, Uley Church, Thursday, November 18, at 2.30. No flowers.

Miss Lloyd-Baker was a lineal descendant of Bishop Lloyd, one of the Seven Bishops sent to the Tower by James II for refusing to publish the Indulgence issued by that sovereign in the interests of Roman Catholic propaganda. It was this protest of the Seven Bishops which resulted in the accession of William, Prince of Orange, the patron saint of Irish Protestantism.

H.D.A.M.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MARKAN APOCALYPSE

By Rev. Dr. S. G. F. Brandon

(Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Manchester)

Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray has recently published the most complete study that has so far appeared in the English language of the eschatological discourse in the thirteenth chapter of *Mark*;[1] indeed in its comprehensiveness it exceeds anything thereon produced by Continental scholars. The major part of the book is devoted to a critical survey of what would seem to be every notable study of the subject, whether by way of monograph or incidental treatment, from the famous *Das Leben Jesu* of David Strauss, which was published in 1835-6. Dr. Beasley-Murray's work is very ably done and in itself it constitutes a valuable contribution to New Testament research—it is interesting to note that with the view of no other scholar does Dr. Beasley-Murray express entire agreement, a fact which is due not to any strikingly original theory of his own but to the extreme acuity of his judgment.

For the period which he has chosen to study, which in fact practically spans the whole history of critical research into Christian Origins, Dr. Beasley-Murray finds that the interpretation of the Markan Apocalypse has been decisively governed by the dilemma which Strauss posed for orthodox believers in his comments upon the recorded teaching of Jesus about his Second Coming (*parousia*), ' Such a thing as he has here prophesied of himself cannot happen to a man. If he prophesied the like of himself and expected it, then to us he is a *fanatic* (Schwärmer) ; if he uttered it of himself without any real conviction, then he was a *braggart and a deceiver.*'[2] Accordingly, New Testament scholars of various confessions, tacitly accepting the premises upon which Strauss based his dilemma, have sought to avoid so fundamental an objection by showing that the prophecies ascribed to Jesus in *Mark* xiii had in fact some other origin. Among the various theories advanced to this end the most notable has been that of the so-called Little Apocalypse, which was first proposed by T. Colani ;[3] according to this theory, the eschatological discourse in *Mark* xiii, or at least an essential part of it, was in origin an apocalypse which was composed either by Jewish Christians or Jews to meet some contemporary situation and later incorporated into the Markan Gospel, where it is represented as a prophecy of Jesus of Nazareth. This Little Apocalypse hypothesis Dr. Beasley-Murray is particularly concerned to prove wrong. This is not a difficult undertaking, especially since there has always been a variety of opinion among those who have held the theory as to the limits of the hypothetical document as incorporated in *Mark* xiii; however, Dr. Beasley-Murray's criticisms could equally well be applied to his own theory that ' the discourse was spoken (by Jesus) on one occasion, but it was reproduced in a fragmentary condition, either through its narration at various times by the apostles or because it was too long to be remembered in its entirety ' (p. 212).[4]

[1] *Jesus and the Future.* (Macmillan, London, 1954; 25/-.)

[2] According to Dr. Beasley-Murray, this dilemma was actually formulated by Strauss in his *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet* (1864); however, it merely accentuates the charge which was implicit in his earlier work.

[3] *Jésus Christ et les Croyances messianiques de son Temps* (Strasbourg, 2nd ed., 1864).

[4] This seems to be the view favoured by Dr. Beasley-Murray, although he is somewhat elusive in his statement on p. 212. The alternative solution defined by him is that 'the original discourse that followed xiii, 3, has been expanded by sayings uttered on other occasions' (*ibid*).

Although so acute in his detection of the weak points in the arguments of those scholars who have sought to explain away the attribution of the eschatological discourse in *Mark* xiii to Jesus, Dr. Beasley-Murray reveals many blind-spots in his statement of the case for the substantial authenticity of the discourse. Thus, in arguing that the setting to the discourse in Mark xiii, 1-3 is convincing in its credibility, he fails to note the obvious artficiality of the opening statement: 'And as he went forth out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, behold what manner of stones and what manner of buildings!'—it is scarcely credible that a Palestinian Jew would have drawn the attention of another Palestinian Jew to the splendour of the Jerusalem Temple with which they would both have been familiar from childhood;[4a] but it is credible in a writer, who, as we shall see, was concerned to tell how Jesus had foretold the destruction of the Temple, which had just been so signally accomplished by the Roman armies under Titus. Then, to take another point: to defend the authenticity of *Mark* xiii, 10, namely, that Jesus foretold that before the end the Gospel must first be preached to the Gentiles, Dr. Beasley-Murray attempts to show that there is evidence that Jesus was universalist in his outlook and so was likely to have made such a statement, but he significantly omits to discuss the problem constituted in this connection by the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman in *Mark* vii, 24-30. We must content ourselves at this juncture with noting one more point: it is one of peculiar gravity, for it concerns the tension which must always exist when a Christian scholar endeavours to study the evidence of Christian Origins objectively. In his survey of the opinions of other scholars Dr. Beasley-Murray rightly adopts the attitude of a scientific historian and criticises accordingly; but when stating his own case, which in effect is that of the traditional interpretation of *Mark* xiii, he slips sometimes from this position of austere objectivity and tacitly assumes the premises of an orthodox theologian. Thus, in seeking to show that it was likely that Jesus should have foretold his triumphant *Parousia,* he adduces as his final argument a *credo*: 'the prophetic feeling of certainty by itself is inadequate to comprehend the unique consciousness of Jesus; we believe we have a right to advance beyond this and say *his conviction of the nearness of the victory was due to the clarity of that vision in his soul*'. We can indeed respect the faith implicit in this assertion, but we may also speculate on the way in which Dr. Beasley-Murray would have dealt with another scholar who had based himself similarly upon an act of faith, but one of secular inspiration. We make this point here not so much in criticism of the author of this important book, but to draw attention to the tension which must inevitably develop when a Christian scholar undertakes to use a scientific technique to defend a traditional doctrine which was originally inspired by a faith generated in an ethos remote from the presuppositions of such a method. This means, in other words, that we must be exceedingly careful in our approach to the study of Christian Origins, so that we never confuse our purpose or deceive ourselves about what we are doing. If we approach the subject as historians, then we must never seek to supplement the evidence of the extant data by drawing upon the convictions which have been inspired by our religious experience; as historians we must often be content with conclusions which seem from the point of view of faith cold or negative.

[4a] Dr. V. Taylor's suggestion (*Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 500), that the note of surprise is easily intelligible in the Galilaean disciple's words, presupposes that the disciple had never visited Jerusalem, at a distance of some 60 miles from Galilee, and had thus never fulfilled an obvious religious duty.

The points of criticism which have so far been raised against Dr. Beasley-Murray's thesis are of a minor nature compared with that to which we must now come; moreover, the issue which is to be discussed is one which has also been neglected, so far as the knowledge of the present writer goes, by other scholars who have concerned themselves with the problem of the Markan Apocalypse.

Throughout his study, which is otherwise so exhaustive, Dr. Beasley-Murray never turns his attention to the problem which is constituted by the fact that the record of *Mark* xiii, 1-2, that Jesus foretold the destruction of the Temple, is denied by implication in *Mark* xiv, 57-8, where it is related that at the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin 'there stood up certain and bare false witness (ἐψευδομαρτύρουν) against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands (χειροποίητον), and in three days I will build another made without hands (ἀχειροποίητον)'.[5] Now, this account appears in the Passion Narrative, which most scholars are agreed in recognising as probably the earliest piece of tradition to acquire definitive form in the primitive Christian community.[6] This being so, we may then reasonably infer that the original Jewish Christians repudiated as a lying calumny against their Master the charge that he had claimed that he would destroy the Temple. This repudiation, moreover, we may note is consonant with other information which we have of the attitude of Jerusalem Christians to the Temple, namely, that they were attentive in their worship there as became pious orthodox Jews.[7] But the certainty that the original disciples denied that their Lord had declared that he would destroy the Temple does not solve the problem involved; in fact it complicates it, because it does in effect describe as a piece of false evidence what appears elsewhere in other early Christian documents as an accepted tradition about Jesus. Thus we may begin by noting first of all that even in the Markan Passion Narrative (xv, 29) it is stated that the crowd on Calvary apparently believed that Jesus had claimed that he would destroy the Temple. This belief, if it stood alone, could, of course, be explained in the sequence of the Markan narrative as a false report against Jesus which the Jewish authorities had purposely propagated among the crowd. However, in the Johannine account of the Cleansing of the Temple (ii, 13-22) the belief appears as one which is held by Christians, for it is related there that when the Jews asked Jesus for proof of his authority for taking the action which he had done, he replied: 'Destroy (λύσατε) this temple, and in three days I will raise it up'. The words attributed to Jesus here are admittedly not a proclamation that he would himself destroy the Temple, but a challenge to his Jewish opponents to do so; nevertheless the significance of the passage remains in that it associates Jesus with a threat against the Temple. Moreover, we must note that the explanation in verse 21 ('But he spake of the temple of his body'), together with the reference to the re-erection in three days, which is reminiscent of the 'three days' in the Markan account, suggests that there was early current in certain Christian circles some saying of Jesus in which the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple was in some way associated with the tradition of his resurrection. But this is not all: in the story of the martyrdom

[5] Dr. Beasley-Murray does briefly discuss (pp. 251-2) the relationship between *Mk.* xiii, 2 and xiv, 58, but without any recognition of the problem discussed here. See the present writer's book, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London, 1951), pp. 37-40.

[6] Cf. V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London, 1935), pp. 45-50, 57-9; *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London, 1952), pp. 524-6, 635-64; C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel* (London, 1938), p. 82; M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (London, 1934), pp. 47-8.

[7] See *Acts*, ii, 46; iii, 1; v, 12, 42; xxi, 23. Cf. Taylor, *Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 566.

of Stephen recorded in the *Acts of the Apostles* we are informed that the charge brought against this Christian leader was that 'This man ceaseth not to speak words against this holy place (i.e. the Temple), and the law: for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us' (vi, 13-14). This charge, like that in *Mark* xiv, 57, is, curiously, imputed to false witnesses (μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς),[8] yet, as the sequel shows, Stephen in his speech before the Sanhedrin fully justified it by his violent attack upon the institution of the Temple (vii, 47-50).

We accordingly discern the lineaments of a strange situation existing in the Church during the first decades of its life. There was apparently a tradition which in some way associated Jesus with a threat against the continuance of the Temple, the unique shrine and centre of Judaism; it is a tradition which may well have been based upon historical fact and have provided the substance of at least one of the causes upon which the Jewish authorities proceeded against Jesus. But this tradition was definitely repudiated by the original Jewish disciples, among whom the Passion Narrative took shape, and was represented by them as a malicious lie perpetrated by the enemies of Jesus, of which the nature was self-evident at the Trial.[9]

This diversity of opinion and action in the first years of the Church about such a basic issue naturally raises several questions of great import for the study of Christian Origins. One of these concerns the identity of those Christians who apparently, in contradistinction to the Jerusalem Christians, cherished the belief that Jesus had condemned the Temple and its cultus.[10] Into such questions we cannot, in view of our present subject, now enter; instead we must turn our attention to investigating the significance of the fact that the author of *Mark,* while incorporating into his record the original Jewish Christian repudiation of the charge that Jesus had claimed that he would destroy the Temple, describes, in obvious contradiction thereto, how Jesus had foretold the destruction of the great Jewish sanctuary.

We must be careful, first, to note that in *Mark* xiii, 1-2 Jesus is depicted as foretelling the destruction of the Temple, but not claiming that he would be the agent thereof. This difference from the tradition, which associated Jesus with some threat against the national shrine, appears to be sustained in the sequel to these verses, in that the destruction of the Temple is there clearly linked as a sign with the expected *Parousia* of Jesus: now, as we have seen, it would seem that the other tradition was understood both by the Jews and by a certain party among the Palestinian Christians as denoting that Jesus was hostile to the essential cultus of Judaism. In other words, it is reasonable to infer that the author of *Mark* was concerned to show that Jesus had foretold the destruction of the Temple, which event he regarded as a sign indicative of the imminency of the Parousia, while at the same time he was

[8] See the note on verse 11 in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (London, 1953), vol. iv, pp 68-9.

[9] Cf. M. Goguel, *The Life of Jesus* (E.T., London, 1933), pp. 504-9; G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Trial of Jesus* (Dr. William's Library Lecture, 1952), pp. 10-13. The treatment of this issue by R. Eisler may be read with profit: see his *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* (London, 1931), pp. 494-500; ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ (Heidelberg, 1930), II, pp. 499-508.

[10] H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen, 1949), pp. 236 sq., would interpret the account of Stephen as evidence that the Jewish Christians were opposed to the Temple and its cultus. Professor M. Simon, *Les Premiers Chrétiens* (Paris, 1952), pp. 45-55, has emphasised the significance of the Stephen episode as attesting the presence of a party among the Palestinian Christians whose aim was 'un judaisme réformé', of which 'le Christ sera l'artisan'. See also M. Simon, 'Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple' in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, II (1951), pp. 127-142.

intent on preserving in his narrative the repudiation of the charge that Jesus had himself threatened to destroy the place and was thereby hostile towards it. We are, accordingly, faced with an obvious question: when would a Christian writer, such as the author of Mark, have been so concerned with the eschatological significance of the destruction of the Temple that he presents the matter in the way in which it is presented in this thirteenth chapter, thereby virtually contradicting his own later statement in xiv, 57-8?

This question brings us to one of the basic problems of the Markan Gospel, namely, the date of its composition. In this country it has become customary to prefer some date before A.D. 70, i.e. before the destruction of the Temple;[11] Dr. Beasley-Murray makes this preference,[12] and it decisively governs his interpretation of the Markan Apocalypse. But there appears to be no irresistible reason for dating the Gospel before A.D. 70 rather than just after that year; on the other hand, Mark's curious handling of the traditions concerning the attitude of Jesus to the national sanctuary, which we have been discussing here but which is generally neglected by New Testament scholars, provides a strong indication of a date immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem and its famous Temple by the Roman legions under Titus.

The force of this indication should perhaps be made clearer than it has emerged by implication in the foregoing discussion. This may best be done by asking whether at some time before A.D. 70 (the year 65 seems to be a favourite date) Christians, apparently resident outside Palestine, could have been so interested in the prospective fate of the Jewish Temple that a narrative could have been composed among them in which Jesus is represented as foretelling its utter destruction, the accomplishment of which is closely linked with the expectation of his imminent Second Coming?—and this prophecy, moreover, virtually contradicting the established tradition, incorporated in the Passion Narrative, that the suggestion that Jesus had threatened the Temple was a malicious calumny put forward by false witnesses at his Trial. Further, before the signal accomplishment of the deed in A.D. 70, there was no reason to suppose that, even in the likely event of a Jewish rising against the Roman government of Judaea, the great Temple at Jerusalem would have been so utterly destroyed that 'there shall not be left one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down'. The destruction of temples was not an established principle of Roman punitive policy, and the Jewish historian Josephus informs us at length that the burning of the Temple was an accident, the dire consequences of which Titus tried at first to prevent.[13] In the light of these considerations no occasion prior to A.D. 70 can surely be discerned which would make the composition of such a narrative then intelligible. But such an occasion can be found in the years immediately following A.D. 70—an occasion which can be shown not only to be consistent with these considerations, but which also illuminates the many puzzles provided by the Markan Apocalypse itself.

The destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of its famed Temple came as the dramatic climax to the bitterly-contested struggle, which lasted from A.D. 66 to 70, between Jewish nationalism, inspired as it was by a fanatical faith in divine providence, and Roman imperialism. This war also coincided with the convulsion of the Roman Empire by civil war. Moreover, for the

[11] E.g., B. H. Streeter in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xi (1936), p. 259, nt.1; V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, pp. 31-2; H. G. Wood in *Peake's Commentary*, p. 681*b*; C. H. Turner in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, II, pp. 44-5.

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 245.

[13] *Wars of the Jews*, vi, 236-243, 250-266. Cf. *The Fall of Jerusalem and The Christian Church*, pp. 120-1, 202.

infant Christian movement it had the most profound consequences: briefly it meant the sudden obliteration of what had been the original fount and centre of the faith, the Mother Church of Jerusalem, and the signal downfall of the proud edifice of Judaism to which those Jerusalem Christians were essentially attached.[14] Now, in seeking to estimate public reaction in the ancient world to notable events we must obviously be mindful of the fact that there existed then none of the means of immediate and dramatic publicity with which we have become so familiar. However, there is reason for believing that the overthrow of the Jewish state was brought home in a singularly graphic manner to the populace of Rome by the elaborate arrangements made for the triumph of Vespasian and Titus in the year A.D. 71. Josephus tells us that among the most impressive of the exhibits on that occasion was a number of *πήγματα*, i.e. movable stages, upon which were depicted in a very realistic manner scenes from the campaign. In the procession also were borne the spoils of the Temple, the seven-branched lamp, the golden table of the shew-bread and a copy of the Torah (*ὅ τε νόμος ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*).[15] Accordingly, if we recall the traditional association of the Markan Gospel with Rome, we may well understand how the reality and the wonder of the destruction of the Temple was impressed upon any Christian who stood on that day in the streets of Rome and watched the passage of this Flavian triumph.

But the destruction of the Temple was not merely a matter for wonderment to Christians as they beheld the evidence of its accomplishment; it was a signal demonstration of the divine purpose which must soon be achieved in the Return of Christ. Consequently it was calculated to fan the excitement which had probably been rising as a result of the general political unsettlement and the fierce persecution which had broken out under Nero. Thus the signs of the times showed that the Parousia was imminent, and tension must have been intense in the Christian community. Yet the heralded *dénouement* did not come. As the weeks and months, which followed the Flavian triumph, steadily passed away a feeling of anticlimax must inevitably have set in and the faith of many was perplexed. It is in this setting that the Markan Apocalypse becomes fully intelligible.

The present writer has set forth at length elsewhere his reasons for believing that the *Gospel of Mark* as a whole was produced in response to the situation which a Christian community, possibly at Rome, found itself confronted with in the immediate aftermath of the fall of Jerusalem and the obliteration of the Mother Church there.[16] Those reasons are complex and range beyond the apocalyptic problem which is being discussed here; however, it can be shown that the eschatological discourse in *Mark* xiii not only fits a situation shortly after A.D. 70, but it also integrates with the larger pattern of *apologia* which informs that *Gospel*.

But to return to *Mark* xiii: it is easily understandable how a Christian writer under the impact of the Jewish overthrow in A.D. 70 was preoccupied with the question of the significance of the Temple's destruction. Surely such an event must signifiy God's declaration of the obsolescence of Judaism? An

[14] The subject has been studied at length by the present writer in his above mentioned book, Cf. Simon, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-5.

[15] *Wars of the Jews*, vii, 139-152. The existing Arch of Titus in the Forum, with its two sculptured panels depicting scenes from the triumph, was not erected until after the death of Titus in A.D. 81. The fact of the overthrow of the Jewish nation was also publicised in the imperial coinage: see A. Reifenburg, *Israel's History in Coins* (London, 1953), pp. 32-3; H. St. J. Hart, 'Judaea and Rome', art. in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii (1952), pp. 172-198 and plates; Brandon, *op. cit.*, p. 202, nt. 2.

[16] *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, chapter 10.

adumbration of this revelation the author of *Mark* records in xv, 37-38, where he tells how the death of Jesus on Calvary was immediately followed by the rending of the veil which hid the sanctuary of the Temple.[17] The decisive event of A.D. 70 then must surely have been foreseen by Jesus—indeed there existed a tradition that he had threatened to effect it: and so the author of *Mark* utilised this tradition, though altering it to the extent that it should not constitute a literal contradiction to the statement in the Passion Narrative that Jesus had been falsely accused at his Trial of speaking against the Temple.

Having thus adroitly shown in xiii, 1-2 that Jesus had foreseen the ruin of the Temple, the author of *Mark* goes on to deal with the question of this event's being a sign of the imminency of the Parousia. In the verses which follow it is clearly evident that the chief field of concern is that of the situation in which the author's fellow Christians found themselves, especially in the light of their recent experiences. The question which is put in the mouth of the disciples in xiii, 4 reveals the prevailing concern, because clearly therein a transition has been tacitly made from the prophecy of the historical event in xiii, 2, to that of the cataclysmatic end of the present world: 'Tell us, when shall these things (*ταῦτα*) be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all (*ταῦτα . . . πάντα*) about to be accomplished?' After the warning against deception in xiii, 5-6, which may have been suggested by the warning against false Christs in xiii, 21-22, the references to 'wars and rumours of war' and to nation rising against nation and kingdom against kingdom reflect the general unsettlement caused by foreign and civil wars during the years A.D. 61 to 70,[18] while the 'earthquakes in divers places' could well be identified with those at Laodicaea in A.D. 60 and at Pompeii in A.D. 63.[19] Verses 9 and 11 to 13 serve to remind the readers that in their growing expectation of the Return of their Lord they must not slacken in their resolution to meet all trials of their faith—probably the recent memory of the persecution under Nero is being invoked here.[20]

Verse 14 not only introduces a new stage in this eschatological discourse, but it may well mark the beginning of an apocalyptic document which was known to the author through its currency in Christian circles in Palestine and which he decided for obvious reasons to insert at this point in his narrative; for, despite all the arguments of Dr. Beasley-Murray against the Little Apocalypse theory, verses 14 to 22 clearly form a pericope which in diction, atmosphere, and locative reference is distinct from the section which precedes it and from that which follows. Confirmation of this view is to be found in verse 14 in the words there given in parenthesis: 'But when we shall see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not (let him that readeth understand), then let them that are in Judaea flee unto the mountains'. Here we surely have a note inserted by the author of *Mark* in the older document in

[17] According to Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, v. 212, the Temple veil symbolised the universe (*ὥσπερ εἰκόνα τῶν ὅλων*). For the tabus connected with the veil see *Tractate Shekalim*, viii, 4 in *The Mishnah* (trans. M. Danby), p. 161. Cf. Taylor, *Gospel according to St. Mark*, pp. 597-6.

[18] In A.D. 61 in Britain the Iceni revolted under Boudicca and in the same year Tigranes invaded Adiabene and threatened Syria. The Jews revolted in A.D. 66. The death of Nero in A.D. 68 marked the beginning of the Roman civil war from which Vespasian eventually emerged as emperor. Cf. B. M. Bersanetti, *Vespasiano* (Rome, 1941), pp. 40-1; M. P. Charlesworth, in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xliii (1942), p. 106; in *The Cambrigde Ancient History*, vol. xi, pp. 44-5.

[19] Tacitus, *Annales*, xiv, 27, xv, 22. Cf. A. Peretti, *La Sibilla babilonese nella Propaganda ellenestica* (Florence, 1943), p. 470.

[20] On the persecution at Rome in A.D. 54, see A. Momigliano, *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. x, p. 725-6.

order to guide his reader to make the correct identification for himself—an identification which it would be unwise to make plainer.[21] There is much reason for believing that the apocalyptic writing which the author of *Mark* is using here was originally inspired by the mad attempt of the Emperor Caligula in the years A.D. 39 to 41 to install his image in the Temple at Jerusalem. Both Philo and Josephus have left us graphic accounts of the profound reaction of the Jewish people to this threatened sacrilege, which equalled the act of Antiochus Epiphanes in setting up an altar in Zeus in the sanctuary of Yahweh. Although death had prevented Caligula from accomplishing his project, the memory of it remained with the Jews as a fear that some other of their heathen masters might attempt to set up 'the abomination of desolation' in the Temple.[22] The fear was finally realised amid catastrophic circumstances in A.D. 70. Josephus tells us that, after they had subdued Jewish resistance in the Temple and while the sanctuary itself (ναός) was still burning, the Roman troops erected their standards in the Temple court, opposite the eastern gate, and there did sacrifice to them and acclaimed Titus, their commander, as Imperator.[23] For a Christian, as for a Jew, these acts were of profound significance, because the standards of the legions were regarded as sacred emblems and they bore images of the gods or the emperor,[24] while the deification of the emperor was already a well-known practice.[25] Hence on that fateful day in A.D. 70 in the Roman standards and the person of the Emperor's son 'the abomination of desolation' stood in the place where it "ought not", namely, within the precincts of the Temple, which now lay in ruins—"let him that readeth understand!"'[26]

From this awful portent and its attendant misery for those who lived in Judaea the author of *Mark* moves on to deal with the expectation of the *Parousia*. It is indeed to come 'after that tribulation'; of this the writer is convinced, and by invoking the parable of the fig-tree in verse 28 he endorses the prevailing belief that the desecration and ruin of the Temple was a sign of the imminency of the Second Advent: 'Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that he is nigh, even at the doors'. And he reinforces the belief with the Dominical assurance: 'This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished.' But, having thus so uncompromisingly affirmed his faith that the *Parousia* would happen within the lifetime of himself and his fellow Christians, he obviously felt that he must take account of the growing puzzlement about the delay of that supreme event, and so he ends with a note of caution and admonition. Earlier in the discourse he had prepared the minds of his readers for such a period of delay by the provision in verse 10 that 'the gospel must first be preached unto all nations': what is the exact connotation of 'all nations' here is unknown, but it certainly suggests a conveniently indefinite period of evangelisation. Accordingly in verse 32 he is better able to advise his fellow-Christians that 'of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' And he seeks to calm their excitement, while at the same

[21] It is significant that Dr. Beasley-Murray, *op. cit.*, pp. 255-7, endeavours to amend the text of xiii, 14, although it is attested by the best MSS.

[22] Cf. Brandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-9.

[23] *Wars of the Jews*, vi, 316.

[24] Cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 857b; Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, plate xxii; ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΩ, Tafel, xxxiv, II, p. 167, and nt. 2.

[25] Cf. A. D. Nock *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. x, pp. 481-9, 493-5, 496-8, 501.

[26] Streeter's contention (*Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xi, p. 259, nt. 1), that *Mk.* xiii cannot contain an allusion to the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70, because of the use therein of the masculine participle ἑστηκό, overlooks the fact of the presence of Titus in the Temple and his rôle on that fateful occasion.

time keeping them vigilant, with the words: 'Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is'.

Seen then in the immediate aftermath of A.D. 70, the Markan Apocalypse becomes a truly intelligible document, and, so interpreted, it affords a valuable insight into the tensions, the hopes and the fears, which beset the minds of a Christian community at one of the most critical junctures in the development of Primitive Christianity, namely, when the original source of its faith and order was suddenly annihilated. Accordingly, Dr. Beasley-Murray's book may fairly be taken as a monument of the learning and ingenuity, as well as of the ceaseless debate, which have been devoted to elucidating the Markan Apocalypse in absence of a proper appreciation of the profound effect which the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 had for the infant Christian Church.

WHAT DID JESUS HOPE FOR?

For a sermon on the Kingdom of God, Dean Inge once chose two very different texts — 'Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God', and 'The Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' — thus drawing attention at the outset to the widely divergent ideas about the Kingdom which the New Testament contains. But not only are such divergent ideas to be found in the New Testament as a whole, they would seem also to have been present in the thought of Jesus Himself. Now He speaks of the Kingdom growing slowly like a grain of mustard seed, now of its coming with power in the lifetime of those standing by. At one time He sees Satan fallen as lightning from heaven, at another He wonders whether the Son of man, when He cometh, will find faith on the earth.

The old-fashioned liberals got over these apparent discrepancies in one way, Schweitzer in another; or rather, they both employed the same selective method, only the choice of what they selected was, of course, entirely different. The guiding principle which determined the choice made by Schweitzer was that Jesus was a misguided fanatic as against the liberal view that He was a misunderstood prophet of social reform. Dr. Dunkerley, in his *Hope of Jesus*,[1] combines something of both these opposed viewpoints, since he holds with Schweitzer that Jesus did expect that the Kingdom would 'immediately appear', but also that it would come through the moral and spiritual regeneration of Israel, which the mission of Jesus was to accomplish. There were, Dr. Dunkerley argues, good grounds for expecting this to happen; hence the rejection of Jesus was a disappointment which He had not looked for; and even despite it, He went to the Cross still believing that by His death and resurrection the hoped-for regeneration would be speedily achieved. The fact that this did not happen does not mean that Jesus was the victim of a delusion, for it ought to have happened. It shows not how deeply Jesus was mistaken, but how fundamental is the principle of contingency even in the most vital and momentous of human affairs.

This is certainly a bold thesis, and a very difficult one to accept. In the first place, we do not have to be determinists to doubt whether chance really plays so decisive a rôle in human affairs, or whether, if it does, there will be any room left for a doctrine of Providence at all. In the second place, the authority of Jesus is in effect made to depend upon the soundness of His alleged belief that the whole-hearted and nation-wide acceptance of Him by

[1] *The Hope of Jesus*, by Roderic Dunkerley. (Longmans, 1953; 15/-.)

the Jews was a genuine probability; but there is really very little reason for supposing that Jesus entertained such a hope — at least after the early days of His ministry — and none at all for thinking that it could have been justified. In fact Dr. Dunkerley refuses to look at human nature in a realistic way, and consequently reads a like refusal into the mind of Jesus Himself. No doubt a world in which He had been acclaimed and not crucified would be a far better one than this; but it would not be this one, and therefore to speculate on what would have happened if Jesus had not been crucified is surely futile.

A similar note of unreality is struck by the easy optimism with which the writer of this book looks forward to the future. He sees only the social progress that has been achieved in recent years with hardly a glance at the appalling spread of barbarism that has accompanied it. A remark quoted from a speech by President Truman to the effect that we are not going to be destroyed is taken to clinch the issue (p. 214).

It is a pity to have to make these criticisms of a book which in many respects, e.g. in its criticism of Form Criticism, shows itself to be on the side of the angels. Dr. Dunkerley is surely right in his insistence that the hope of Jesus rested upon a moral basis — though, as Rashdall pointed out in *Conscience and Christ*, ethics and apocalyptic are not necessarily mutually exclusive; both can have their place in a moral eschatology. Baffling as the apocalyptic element in the Gospels is, it does at least serve to make clear that the Kingdom of God is something more than a kingdom of human aspiration. In *The Hope of Jesus* it has to be confessed that the distinction between them does tend to become unduly blurred. When, for example, a concept of the kingdom is held up for our approval (p. 194) in which, among other things, there is to be indifference to thrift and culture, we are reminded horribly of the Welfare State. So long as such a mistaken identity is possible, there will be something to be said for Schweitzer after all.

D. L. Scott

SOUTH INDIA AND THE ANGLICAN CRISIS

The year 1955 is a momentous one for the Anglican Communion, when it will have to face in practical fashion the problem of Christian Reunion determined in and through its relation to the Church of South India. It is faced with three options:

(1) To do the right thing.
(2) To do the wrong thing.
(3) To do nothing at all.

The third option is overwhelmingly tempting to our authorities, yet, as the saintly Francis Paget affirmed, 'to do nothing when we ought to do something is the height of rashness'.

The seven Westcott House priests, headed by their Principal, the Rev. K. M. Carey, authors of *The Historic Episcopate*,[1] are profoundly concerned lest the Church of England should adopt the third option. They write:

> 'To delay for even ten years is both dangerous and unrealistic. It is dangerous because it is always dangerous to postpone a decision which Truth is pressing on the conscience. If there is no other reason to delay, then it is clearly wrong to delay simply in the hope of becoming more sure. It is unrealistic, because it is a refusal to face the facts of the

[1] *The Historic Episcopate*. Seven Essays by priests of the Church of England, edited by K. M. Carey. (A. & C. Black, 1954; 8/6.)

world situation. The world, in which the Church is set to minister, is not static: it is on the move. In Asia it is moving very fast indeed. The Church in South India is not only confronted by vast masses of non-Christians to whom our Western divisions are quite unintelligble; it also has to combat the growing forces of nationalism and Communism' (p. 136).

The seven priests have done well in emphasizing that the real issue is not between those who maintain that the historic episcopate is of the *esse* of the Church and those who maintain it is of the *bene esse*, but between those who maintain that episcopacy is of the *plene esse* of the Church as against those who have no use whatsoever for the historic episcopate.

Our authors stand for an apostolic, universal, paternal episcopate as the ideal and ultimate method of Church organization and administration, and maintain that their ideal is justified by a growing Christian experience in the face of the Church's needs and problems in its task of converting the human race to the acceptance of the Christian religion in its profoundest, simplest and most practical form. The ideal episcopate is the *pleroma* of the organization of the body of Christ and rests on the convincing evidence that the best argument for episcopacy is the demonstrated value of episcopal administration.

Our seven authors are also convinced that the Church of England can to-day support and adopt many co-operative methods of achieving this ideal without sacrificing the essentials of its own ecclesiastical organization. Christian unity does not demand Church uniformity. Christian unity should be worked for as a dynamic evolutionary ideal and not as a static organization. It is something to be achieved at sundry times and in divers manners wherein race, location, and degrees of civilization are factors which, although secondary, yet cannot be ignored. But the effort to achieve Christian unity must not postpone intercommunion as its final ideal, but include it at an early stage as the most important factor in developing and achieving Christian Reunion.

H.D.A.M.

BISHOP BERKELEY (1685—1753)

Hermathena,[1] edited by Professor W. B. Stanford, F.T.C.D.,—'a series of papers on literature, science and philosophy by members of Trinity College, Dublin'—has as the subject of its latest issue George Berkeley (1685—1753), philosopher, mathematician, economist, and man of letters. The papers dealing with him, eight in number, were read at public meetings held in Trinity College, Dublin, to commemorate the bicentenary of Berkeley's death. Two of them, 'Berkeley's Search for Truth', by Canon A. A. Luce, D.D., and Senator Joseph Johnston's estimate of Berkeley's influence as an economist, are the work of members of the college staff; the rest, among which may be included a sermon preached in the college chapel by Canon I. T. Ramsey, Nolloth Professor of the Christian Religion at Oxford, are contributions by widely separated students of Berkeley, one of them a professor at the University of Iowa. Other papers, Berkeleian in character, read before members of the Aristotelian Society, the Mind Association, and the Irish Philosophical Club, meeting in joint session when the public Commemoration ended, have been published in the *Proceedings* of the Aristotelian Society.

The *Hermathena* papers, with the exception of Professor Whitrow's review of 'Berkeley's critique of the Newtonian analysis of motion', should be intelli-

[1] Published by Hodges, Figgis. No. lxxxii, November, 1953; 10/-.

gible to those who have had what used to be called (in happier times) a liberal education. Professor Bonamy Dobrée's delightful talk about Berkeley as a man of letters was easy to follow in the lecture hall, and in print it is at least as easy to appreciate; but most of the papers, though they can be followed without such specialized knowledge as that which Professor Whitrow's mathematical argument calls for, demand greater mental effort.

Professor Leroy's paper (in French) shows us Berkeley through the eyes of German and French thinkers, finding a close kinship between the minds of Berkeley and Bergson. Both philosophers 'put the concrete before the abstract, practice before theory, philosophy before science, and the soul before the intellect'. Both reacted vigorously against the dominant scientific doctrines, Bergson opposing Spencerian notions of evolution and Taine's association psychology, as Berkeley opposed Carterian mechanism, Newtonian physics, and Locke's 'representationism'.

Of Berkeley as a man, husband and father, or as a citizen, not much is said in these papers, the writers being perhaps aware that not much, if anything, could be added to what Dr. Luce has told in his *Life of Berkeley*. Professor Jessop, of University College, Hull, who contributed the introductory essay, was evidently attracted by the human aspect of his subject. He would gladly have claimed Berkeley as a fellow-countryman, if Berkeley had let him do so. Berkeley, however, like the Anglo-Irishmen of his time, was no more a West Briton than was George Washington. The Irish Sea was very wide in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Professor Jessop regards Berkeley as 'one of the most variously gifted men our islands have had'; as being in fact 'perhaps the most civilized man of his day'. What he looked like as a young man is shown in the portrait which serves as frontispiece to this number of *Hermathena*, as it has already served in Dr. Luce's *Life* of the philosopher. It is a portrait worth studying, especially if the students include any who still think of Berkeley as a dreamer. Bishop Berkeley spent the last years of his life in Christ Church, Oxford, and his body is buried in its cloisters.

H. R. Chillingworth

A SCHOOLMASTER'S LIFE OF CHRIST*

Canon H. K. Luce, M.A., B.D., Headmaster of Durham School and in earlier life Master of the King's Scholars, Westminster, has performed a great service in the cause of New Testament education by his latest volume, *The Life of Christ in the Four Gospels*.

It unites and completes his teaching on this theme extending over many years. It is intended primarily for use in schools, but many who have left their school days far behind will find that Canon Luce's latest book has much to teach them. It is amazingly lucid, concise and above all judicious in the selection and treatment of its themes.

Its unique contribution will be found in its presentation of the Fourth Gospel. Only those scholarly clergymen who have been faced with the extreme difficulty of teaching the Gospels as made known to us by modern literary and historical criticism in such a way as to illuminate their significance without undermining the Christian Faith of 'the weaker Brethren', can appreciate fully the masterly manner in which Canon Luce has performed his task.

There are naturally many points on which the modern student finds himself in agreement with Canon Luce, e.g. the conclusion that St. Paul's

* *The Life of Christ in the Four Gospels*, by Canon H. K. Luce, M.A., B.D., Headmaster of Durham School. (A. & C. Black, 1953; 6/6.)

Epistle to the *Galatians* (not I *Thessalonians*) is the earliest written of the surviving Pauline Epistles. Again, Canon Luce's emphasis on the changing method in the Primitive Christian conception of the person of Jesus is most valuable. The first generations of believers thought of Jesus the Christ as Man first and God afterwards but their successors thought of Him as God first and Man afterwards, and later even as not Man at all. Again, Canon Luce's emphasis on the noble side as well as the ignoble side of Pharisaism hits the target:

> 'To the Pharisee of Jesus' time all the wrong things mattered. He saw the big things small and the small things big' (p. 11.)

In treating of the origin of the Pharisees, Canon Luce has not included Professor T. W. Manson's illuminating conclusion that the name Pharisee is not derived from a Hebrew root meaning schismatic but is a nickname *Persians* or *Parsees* given to those Jews who had supplemented their traditional Judaism by doctrines derived from Persian Zoroastrianism (e.g. the existence of Satan, the universal world-judgement, etc.) adopted during the period of the Exile down to 333 B.C. when Alexander the Great terminated the Persian domination of Palestine. The Saducees, on the other hand, restricted their theology to the contents of the Pentateuch.

After pointing out how widely the presentation of Jesus in St. John's Gospel differs from that of the Synoptic Gospels, Canon Luce sums up:

> 'The value of the fourth Gospel to us to-day lies in its author's interpretation of Jesus; even here, since his ways of thinking and the language which he naturally uses, are different from ours, we shall have to do a good deal of re-interpretation for ourselves. But the author, whoever he may be, is a man of outstanding spiritual insight who has found in Jesus the solution of life's problems, both intellectual and moral, and the only adequate support and comfort for his own personal living. His thought, which looks simple at first, goes very deep—and because it goes so deep and is concerned with the greatest things in life, it does not "date" (any more than Plato or Shakespeare do), or grow stale with familiarity. That is why this Gospel seems so strangely modern—even in an atomic age' (p. 17).

H.D.A.M.

BULTMANN DEMYTHOLOGIZED*

The S.P.C.K. has done well to publish an English edition of this work which forms the most convenient account of Professor R. Bultmann's attempt to 'demythologise' the Gospel and of the reactions of certain German theologians to that attempt. In Germany, Bultmann's undertaking appears to be as symptomatic of the strivings and tensions of German religious thought in the aftermath of the Second World War as was that of Karl Barth in the years which followed Germany's defeat in 1918. In this country publicity has been given to Bultmann's thesis through a series of talks in the B.B.C. Third Programme, although it may be fairly doubted whether these expositions really illuminated the significance of the issue for a British audience.

* *Kerygma and Myth*, edited by H. W. Bartsch; translated by R. H. Fuller. (S.P.C.K., London, pp.xii+228, 1953; 22/6.)

The volume concerned here contains Professor Bultmann's original statement of his thesis, together with the criticisms of four German scholars and Bultmann's replies (all of which appeared in the original German edition of *Kerygma und Mythos*, Hamburg, 1948), and it ends with 'An English Appreciation' by Dr. A. Farrer. Since Bultmann's original statement has already been examined at length by the present writer in an article in the *Modern Churchman*,[1] it will suffice here to comment generally on the thesis and the reaction of Bultmann's critics.

Possibly the chief impression which the reader will receive from this book is one of confusion of address—with whom is Bultmann really concerned and to whom are his critics addressing their replies? At first sight it appears that Bultmann is very conscious of the difficulty which a man, educated in the modes of twentieth-century thought, finds when he comes to examine Christian doctrine as an interpretation of Man and his destiny. Accordingly, the presumption is that Bultmann is attempting the urgent task of showing the enduring relevancy of Christianity, apart from the mythical imagery in which it was first clothed by the primitive Christians, who necessarily thought in terms of the ideas which were current in their day. Along these lines Bultmann seems to go a considerable way until he reaches an *impasse,* which he contrives to surmount by a veritable somersault from the position of a scientific historian to that of a fervent evangelist—'How do we come to believe in the cross as the cross of Christ and as the eschatological event *par excellencé*? How do we come to believe in the saving efficacy of the cross? There is only one answer. This is the way in which the cross is proclaimed (the essential word here is verkündigt). It is always proclaimed together with the resurrection. Christ meets us in the preaching as one crucified and risen. He meets us in the word of preaching and nowhere else' (E.T., p. 41). In view of this sudden change of rôle, it is perhaps not surprising to find that in his answer to his critics Dr. Bultmann explains: 'Our radical attempt to demythologize the New Testament is in fact a perfect parallel to St. Paul's and Luther's doctrines of justification by faith alone apart from the works of the Law'. But Bultmann at least starts with an appreciation of the difficulties which confront the modern mind when it considers the Gospel; his critics seem in no way concerned with this aspect of the issue, and they pursue their arguments as though they were addressing theologians only, and theologians, moreover, who think within the terms of Lutheran theology. Consequently, although some valuable things are said incidentally about existentialist philosophies and the significance of the distinctions in German thought between *Historie* and *Geschichte,* it seems probable that most English readers will find that much of this volume has an air of unreality and deals with ideas and issues which do not seem to be relevant to the religious situation as seen through English eyes.

It is unfortunate that this general criticism has to be made, because Dr. Bultmann does begin by facing a problem of fundamental import. As the present writer attempted to show in the article to which reference has been made, Bultmann's undertaking has a great significance, for it raises the issue of the proper evaluation of the historicity of Christianity. But Bultmann finally avoids the issue by asserting that we must not 'tie our faith in the word of God to the results of historical research'; and his critics never raise the question of the historical origins of the Gospel, nor do they consider the problem of interpretation which is fundamental to any appreciation of the genesis and development of Christian belief in the unique nature and mission of Jesus of Nazareth. Moreover, it is also significant of the terms of reference in this

[1] Vol. xliii (1953), pp. 86-98.

controversy about ' demythologising ' the Gospel that ' myth ' and ' mythology ' are very narrowly defined, and no account is taken of the fact that the comparative study of religion has shown the great variety of myth in origin, form and function.

The English translation reads smoothly; where comparison has been made with the German original it has been found that the sense has been well conveyed by readjusting the word-order. The English section of the Bibliography contains no item later than 1952.

S. G. F. Brandon

A HANDBOOK FOR BIBLICAL TEACHERS*

New Testament Literature by T. Henshaw is a book not intended for specialists but for those desiring or requiring general knowledge of the New Testament literature whom the author classified as Training College Students, Pass Degree candidates and sixth form scholars.

Such a book demands qualities of selection, generalisation and arresting lucidity. It must avoid extremes and rhetoric yet it has to secure a distinguished place among a large body of competitors. T. Henshaw's book seems to us to achieve its aim in this pedestrian department and a student using it will secure a great deal of useful knowledge carefully arranged and central in character. The *interims-ethik* of Schweitzer, the sceptical extremes of Form-Cricitism do not obtrude themselves. We have instead the solidities of the statistical data of B. H. Streeter and the well-balanced conclusions of Vincent Taylor. The Jewish background of the New Testament is particularly well done; the same may be said of the account given of the religious characteristics of the Graeco-Roman World in which Primitive Christianity had to win its way. Where such a vast body of knowledge has to be analysed and summarised errors of various kinds are bound to occur, e.g. Tertullian's epigram, ' the blood of martyrs is the seed of Christians ' is mistranslated as ' the seed of the Church.'

Again, we find ourselves unable to accept the amazing statement: ' The really astonishing fact is that in all the centuries before Christ, no biography of anyone had ever been written in any language. The first century A.D. invented biography ' (p. 50.)

Cornelius Nepos, the friend of Cicero, composed his biographies in the first century B.C. We should have thought that even Xenophon in the fourth century B.C. by his composition of the *Memorabilia* might be claimed to be the biographer of Socrates. Justin Martyr by describing the Synoptic Gospels as *Memorabilia* places their writers in the same class as Xenophon.

H.D.A.M.

* *New Testament Literature*, by T. Henshaw, M. A. (Allen & Unwin, 1952; 25/-.)

THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE*

American generosity combines in a remarkable degree liberality with utility: an example of this is the admirable practice of wealthy parishioners making presents of expensive and inspiring books to their clergyman with the expressed hope that he will be able to make use of the volume in his sermons. The latest American venture in the field of Biblical studies intended primarily for the use of educated Bible teachers and readers provides an

* *The Interpreter's Bible.* New York (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press); Edinburgh (Nelson & Sons, Edinburgh, 1953; £3 7s. 6d.)

admirable opportunity for the educational generosity of the American laity. *The Interpreter's Bible* is a book which every pastor will be glad to possess and which no parishioner need hesitate to give. The American edition of *The Interpreter's Bible* comprises twelve volumes. The first volume, which consists of 1,100 pages clearly printed in double columns, can now be bought from its English publisher (Nelson, Edinburgh) for £3 7s. 6d.

We do not know how far the American publishers, Abingdon-Cokesbury, are advanced with the American edition, but when completed it will contain eight million words, and will have cost over a million dollars to produce. This is surely a record for Biblical Commentaries.

Some points about the Commentary:

1. It is entirely in English, but contains many translated citations from foreign writers and from patristic and scholastic commentators.

2. Two English versions are used in the Commentary: the Authorized Version of King James and the modern American Revised Standard Version. These two versions are arranged in parallel columns. The Commentary sections are comprehensively and definitely modern, and in them references are made to the work of many British, American, and Continental scholars. The Commentary is most usefully divided into two classes:

(a) *Exegesis*, which of course is textual, critical, and historical;

(b) *Exposition* which is of a much more general, illustrative, and practically suggestive character, most helpful for the preacher and Bible-class leader.

In the Commentary no particular ecclesiastical or doctrinal school is reflected and there seems to be an entire avoidance of condemnation and criticism of those commentators whose conclusions are of a different kind. The temper of the Commentary is open-minded and urbane, and is entirely free from aggressive self-assertion and sectarian prejudice. The user of the Commentary is left free to judge for himself of the value of the material which the Commentary supplies.

> The publishers of the *Interpreter's Bible* assert that 'For each Biblical book the writer of the Exegesis summarizes all that Scholarship has contributed to the understanding of the book, by showing its historical setting, sources, purpose, author, intended readers, and content.'

This first volume opens with a persuasive, lucid and eminently educational article on the Significance and Authority of the Bible, by Dr. H. H. Farmer, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Among other contributors to the whole Commentary we venture to select some of those best known to our British students: E. L. Allen, H. J. Cadbury, Sloane Coffin, Burton S. Easton, H. E. W. Fosbroke, F. C. Grant, W. F. Howard, A. M. Hunter, G. G. D. Kilpatrick, Nathaniel Micklem, T. H. Robinson, E. F. Scott, N. H. Snaith, W. L. Sperry and Vincent Taylor.

This is eminently a work which is going to inspire many of our Biblical teachers and assist the cause of unity in Christendom and also strengthen the influence of Christendom on the non-Christian world.

H.D.A.M.

THE NEW CAMBRIDGE A.V. BIBLE*

The Cambridge University Press claims and is justified in claiming to have produced in its *Pitt Minion Reference Bible* 'for everyday use a Bible which is clear to read, beautiful to look at, and convenient to handle'. It is the authorized Version of King James I printed in a beautiful type designed by

* *Pitt Minion Reference Bible* (C.U.P., Bentley House, N.W.1, 1953; £3.)

Stanley Morison. Its method of placing references in a centre column relieves the text from the figures and numbers which for more than three centuries have distracted the eye of the reader.

The *Pitt Minion Reference Bible* is available in 29 styles ranging in price from 13/6 to 67/6. Excellent maps, helpful concordances and in some cases coloured illustrations are included in the different styles. The binding, the paper, as well as the print, are most attractive.

H.D.A.M.

THE ONE CHURCH*

This is the title of a recent American book, with the important addition of 'In the Light of the New Testament'. An important addition, for, as is familiar to all historians and philosophers, the 'One Church' about which ecumenical gatherings largely debate is at the furthest remove from the teaching of Jesus.

It is a welcome book, for it shows how in the United States — frequently regarded as the home of an outmoded 'fundamentalism' in religious thought— a tide is moving towards a better, fuller and deeper 'Unity' than is envisaged in the ecclesiastical and theological islands of Europe. Though the book was written before this year's World Council meetings it may still be of value to preachers and teachers. The author, encompassed in his own country by groups of evangelical Christians 'stressing radical independency', maintains that 'the obstacles springing from radical independency must be confronted just as resolutely as those which are founded on "Catholic" presuppositions.'

In a series of short chapters Dr. Craig looks at the present Church in terms of its 'crisis', its 'limits', its 'form', its 'continuity', its conditions of 'entrance', its 'communion', its 'goal' within the ecumenical movement, and its 'faith'. The last chapter seems to me the most important.

It is a familiar fact that the doctrinal basis of the World Council of Churches is that 'Jesus Christ is God and Saviour'. I have a vivid memory of an ecumenical committee in which, about fifteen years ago, I had the termity to declare that I had only three objections to this 'Basis': first, it was not 'orthodox'; second, it was not scriptural; third, it was not true— referring, of course, to the implied identification of Jesus with 'God'. I gather that this doctrinal basis remains, on the priniciple of the practical statesman that discretion is the better part of valour and of truth. The author of this little book, like many others, prefers a biblical statement here. His own suggestion may be added to the list of suggested substitutes: 'All Christian bodies which affirm that God has sent Jesus Christ as the Saviour of men and accept Him as the Lord of Life.' He further recognises that while the Nicene Creed is 'a valuable affirmation of faith', division must result from trying to make it 'a measuring rod for all'. He also knows from his experience in ecumenical councils that when a change is made in this 'Basis' it will in all probability be to 'a specifically Trinitarian statement'. If that day comes, it is to be hoped, first, that it will not be another canopy of evasion, and, second, that it will not unchurch or excommunicate sincere and untheological followers of Jesus.

I will close this brief notice of a useful book with some words of Erasmus that seem to me relevant to the present situation.

* *The One Church, in the Light of the New Testament*, by C. T. Craig. (First published in U.S.A., 1951; now by The Epworth Press; 10/6.)

'The sum of religion is peace, which can only be when definitions are as few as possible, and opinion is left free on many subjects. Our present problems are said to be waiting for the next Oecumenical Council. Better let them wait till the veil is removed and we see God face to face'.

C. J. WRIGHT, Barfrestone Rectory

LAMENNAIS: *PROPHECY AND PAPACY*

A book by Canon Vidler, dedicated to Professor Norman Sykes, could hardly fail to be good; nor is the reader of this new study of Lamennais[1] likely to find himself disappointed. Lamennais died just a century ago, but here the story of his life is taken only as far as 1836 when his rupture with the Papacy had become complete. It is in fact a story of the perennial conflict between the prophet and the priest, but a highly unusual version of it, none the less, since in this instance the prophet erred largely through the excess of zeal with which he desired to see the power of the priesthood confirmed in its papal head as the infallible guardian of justice and social liberty.

If Lamennais had been born in England towards the end of the nineteenth century he might well have enjoyed a flourishing career. Under such circumstances it is not difficult to imagine him becoming an apostle of Life and Liberty and attaining to high preferment in consequence. But in fact he was born in France in 1782. Both his father and his uncle sympathized warmly with the Revolution in its opening phase — their sympathies having been kindled, like those of many of their compatriots at the flame of Jean Jacques Rousseau. At a later stage, however, they both came sufficiently close to the guillotine to have some reason for a drastic alteration of their views. So it was that Lamennais came to manhood upon a tide that was flowing strongly against the half-baked sentimentalism which had been invoked with such frightful and unlooked for results. Possessed of outstanding literary gifts, he became, says Canon Vidler,

> 'the natural spokesman of a generation that had been educated in the doctrines of the eighteenth century and then had been horrified by the way in which they had issued in anarchy and despotism during the revolution, and yet a generation that had not abandoned the axioms of its youth, since so far it had found no positive faith with which to replace them. Lamennais had had to struggle hard for a positive faith, but he had found one and knew just what he wanted to say.'

Rapidly he became celebrated as a Christian apologist. Though the Jesuits issued a secret directive that his writings were not to be studied in their colleges, Lamennais was received by the Pope in 1824 with much show of goodwill. Canon Vidler, however, discounts the rumour that he was ever offered a cardinal's hat. But soon the Apologist had passed on to more dangerous and controversial ground. Whereas the Gallican sympathies of the French Church were overwhelmingly strong, Lamennais became convinced that the Church required complete freedom from state control; in other words, that it should be dis-established and dis-endowed, and the control of its affairs centred in the Vatican alone. Only a spiritual power, so he insisted, could be 'the supreme defender of justice, and of the rights of humanity' and that spiritual power could be none other than the power of Rome. It never occurred to him, Canon Vidler remarks,

[1] *Prophecy and Papacy*, by Alec R. Vidler. (S.C.M. Press. 25/-. 1954.)

'that the unity of the universal church really resides in the Holy Ghost rather than the papacy, and that what really keeps earthly rulers in their place is not the fear of the pope but the fear of God. It may be that national churches, without reference to the papacy, can bear as powerful a witness as the papacy itself to the authority of a living God' (*Prophecy and Papacy*, p. 114).

But to most French churchmen, however loyal to the Pope they might be, the value of a national Church was immediately evident. It seemed to them a shocking and scandalous thing that anyone should be ready to abandon the claim of the Church to a privileged and exclusive position. This may surprise us to-day, since, as Canon Vidler points out, we have become so accustomed to members of an established Church demanding liberation from 'bondage' to the state. An angry exchange took place between Lamennais and the Archbishop of Paris which only provoked the former to sharpen his attack still further.

'I dare say,' says Canon Vidler, 'that to "anglo-catholics" it would seem to be all in the day's work, but I doubt whether any roman-catholic priest in good standing has ever publicly attacked his eccleciastical superiors with such devastating irony and lofty disdain. It seemed as though—the holy see being vacant—Lamennais had taken upon himself to be the pope's deputy and to show how craven and misguided bishops should be dealt with' (p. 140).

The next year, 1830, saw the beginning of the end. The July revolution which put Louis Philippe upon the throne seemed to be the confirmation of all that Lamennais had feared. What might not happen if the Crown continued to nominate to vacant bishoprics now that the Crown had been snatched by such impious hands? (In fact, with one or two initial exceptions, the appointments made by the 'Citizen King' proved to be beyond reproach.) In this context Lamennais and his friends began to give expression to their views through a daily newspaper, the *Avenir*. It claimed, so Canon Vidler tells us,

'to be integrally catholic and sincerely liberal; integrally catholic in its unshakable attachment and submission to the centre of unity in Rome; sincerely liberal in its determination to defend the liberties of all individuals and communities within the state whatever their opinions, for "true liberalism . . . understands that liberty must be equal for all or it is secure for no one"' (p. 163).

The paper became something of an infant prodigy, and though its circulation was never large it continued for just over a year. Then it was dramatically suspended while Lamennais, accompanied by his two friends and collaborators, Montalembert and Lacordaire, departed to Rome to seek the Pope's blessing upon their enterprize.

'If we retire for a moment,' Lamennais wrote in the final issue, 'it is not from weariness, still less from despondency; it is that we may go, as once upon a time the soldiers of Israel went, *to consult the Lord in Shiloh* . . .'

They would go to the Pope as the Vicar of Jesus Christ and beg him to condescend

'to look upon some of the least of your children, who are accused of being rebels against your infallible and mild authority: behold them before you: read what is in their minds . . . if even a single one of their thoughts deviates from yours, they disavow it, they abjure it. You are the rule of

what they teach; never have they known any other' (*Prophecy and Papacy*, p. 193-4).

From the end of December 1831 until the following July the three friends remained at Rome. That the Pope could withhold his blessing from those who were so utterly devoted to him seemed to Lamennais unthinkable. For indeed his devotion for the Holy See at this time knew no bounds. Thus in his role of a liberal crusader he had encouraged the peoples of Belgium, Poland and Ireland, through the columns of the *Avenir*, to struggle for their faith and freedom; but when revolt broke out in the Papal States—the administration of which, as Canon Vidler observes, 'was at this time about as inefficient and effete as could well be imagined'—it appeared to Lamennais to be a revolt of 'jacobins and anarchists' who were fighting against 'the most mild, the most pacific, the most legitimate government in the world.' Happily he had not yet heard the report that the Holy Father had come to a most convenient arrangement with the Czar, who was to be given a free hand in Poland in return for sending Russian troops to support the tottering ruins of the Papal empire.

Nevertheless the three pilgrims were left for some time without any official recognition of their visit. Not until March did the Pope consent to give them audience. Then, after keeping them waiting for an hour, he chatted pleasantly with them for fifteen minutes about nothing in particular and sent them on their way. Lamennais refused to be discouraged. The silence of the Vatican he took to be a sign of its tacit approval. 'Puisqu'on ne veut pas me juger,' he said, 'je me tiens pour acquitté.' So, when at last they departed, it was with the confident intention of restarting the *Avenir* as soon as possible. Then the blow fell. It came by way of the encyclical, *Mirari Vos*; the first of Gregory XVI's pontificate. Neither Lamennais nor his paper were mentioned by name, but no shadow of doubt was left regarding the Papal views upon their doctrines. Canon Vidler summarizes seven points which were directed especially against them:

> '(i) The idea that, if the church is to be preserved and increased, it stands in need of restoration and regeneration is characterized as absurd and supremely insulting. (ii) The maxim that liberty of conscience ought to be assured and guaranteed to everyone is said to be sheer madness . . . (iii) Liberty of publication is described as abominable and detestable. Pope Clement XIII's saying that the only way to deal with erroneous books is to burn them is quoted with approval. (iv) Those who encourage subjects to revolt against their rulers are unequivocally condemned and likened to the Waldensians, Wycliffites, and other sons of Belial. (v) The separation of church and state is disapproved. (vi) Associations or unions between catholics and people of other religions are said to have caused the Holy Father particular distress. (vii) 'Our dearest sons in Jesus Christ, the princes, are said to have been given their authority not only for temporal government but chiefly for the defence of the Church' (p. 214).

After all that he had promised there was nothing left to Lamennais but to submit. His campaign apparently reached its absolute end. For a short time, certainly, it did come to an end, and Lamennais accepted with the best grace he could summon the words that God had spoken through His earthly vicar. But it was not surprizing that a serious conflict of loyalties was beginning to rise within him. 'Providence,' he wrote in 1833, 'has sent Gregory XIV to close a long period of crimes and ignominy, to show the world just how low the human part of the divine institution can sink: may he do his work and do it quickly. *Quod facis, fac citius.*' Already he was getting into trouble again

by publishing a French translation of an apocalyptic treatise designed to encourage the Polish exiles in their adversities. The Pope rebuked him, describing the book as 'full of temerity and malice.' Once again, and for the last time, Lamennais made his submission, declaring his absolute and unqualified acceptance of the doctrines which *Mirari Vos* had propounded.

Yet even as he did so the most inflammatory of all his writings was burning in his pocket. For some time the conviction had been growing upon him that a great catastrophe was at hand in which God would judge the corruption of the world, after which there would be a realization on the plane of history of a new age in which Christ's power as the liberator of all peoples would be manifest. The Polish book he had just translated had influenced his thoughts in the same direction. Now, early in 1834, his own *Paroles d'un Croyant* made its appearance. 'There is,' says Canon Vidler,

> 'no book quite like it—no book that has caught to the same extent the spirit and style of the prophetic and apocalyptic writings of the Bible, together with the simplicity of the evangelical parables . . . As Le Hir has said: "Like the prophets of the Old Testament Lamennais believed that he had received a mission from heaven, and in order to strike the tyrants, and to cast their insults and blasphemies in their teeth, he shows them, in terrifying visions, their shame and their ruin; to the men who are victims of an atrocious tyranny he unveils the peaceful horizons of the promised Land and the splendours of the new Jerusalem"' (*Prophecy and Papacy*, p. 246).

And yet, despite the fact that his renewed submission to the Papacy was but a few months old, it is clear that Lamennais did not feel that he was committing any breach of faith or expect that any condemnation would follow the publication of his book. It was, he considered, a political treatise about which the Church would have no cause to be concerned. By its publication, Canon Vidler tells us, he felt that he had made his vision clear.

> 'He had demonstrated that, while he was willing to submit to the Church in matters properly ecclesiastical, he was not going to abandon the cause of the poor and oppressed nor silently to connive at the proceedings of the despotic governments that held sway in Europe' (p. 250.)

But the Pope had no choice but to condemn this new apocalypse even if he had not wanted to do so. Metternich was demanding that the Holy Father should take decisive action against 'this atrocious man . . . who dares to behave so culpably towards the church and the whole of human society.' The Czar and the King of Prussia were making similar representations. Within three months of its first appearance *Paroles d'un Croyant* had been duly condemned in the encyclical *Singulari Nos* as a book 'small in size but immense in its perversity.' The censure upon Lamennais was no longer merely implicit as it had been in *Mirari Vos;* 'It looked', says Canon Vidler, 'as if Gregory XVI was determined once and for all to have done with the whole mennaisian movement.' Lamennais himself was never formally excommunicated, but two years after the publication of *Singulari Nos* he finally bade farewell to the Roman Church in his *Affaires de Rome* which Canon Vidler considers to be his most accomplished book and the one that will live longest. Catholicism, he now believed, was bound to die, but he was still convinced that real Christianity would be the religion of the future.

> 'What one rejects,' he wrote, 'is not authentic Christianity, but a certain sterile and material system that has taken its name and disgraces it; what is dying is not the divine tree, but the withered bark that covers it.'

It is at this point at which Lamennais passes out of Church history that Canon Vidler brings his story to its conclusion. In a way this is a pity, for we should have liked to have had the story of Lamennais's life complete. But although he had still nearly twenty years to live, his conflict with the Papacy had now come to an end. Canon Vidler does not hold with the fashionable view that because the historian can never be altogether impartial he does not need to be as impartial as he can. He tells his story therefore in a plain and objective manner and leaves the reader to draw his own lessons from it. But none the less in a brief epilogue he does not conceal the fact that his own sympathies are divided. 'Both priest and prophet,' he remarks, 'are indispensable. "Had there been no prophecy," said H. L. Goudge, "we should not care to read the story of Israel. Had there been no priesthood, there would be no story to read."' Gregory was a good priest with the limitations that that involved, while Lamennais was an authentic prophet with all the prophet's impatience. He forgot that the prophet is at liberty to speak with greater urgency than the priest is to act; that as a prime duty the priest has the structure of his Church to maintain.

> 'Lamennais's creed,' says Canon Vidler, 'might almost be summed up in a single article: I believe in the social mission of the church. The priests had to make sure that there would still be a church to have a social mission' (*Prophecy and Papacy*, p. 281).

But though there were shortcomings on both sides, Canon Vidler indicates plainly that they were greater on the part of Gregory than of Lamennais. Above all, the Pope was at fault in the way Lamennais was treated by him. Had he been frank and friendly during the fateful months that Lamennais spent at Rome, he could, on the latter's own confession, have gained his confidence and perhaps have persuaded him to moderate his opinions without any compromising of his own. Thus the rupture between them might have been altogether avoided.

But although Lamennais was condemned, the Church which condemned him has not scrupled to make a judicious use of his opinions whenever it has suited its policy to do so. If Gregory XVI somewhat misread the signs of the times his successors have tried to correct, or at least to cover up, the mistakes he made. In a democratic age the Papacy no longer draws attention to the doctrines of *Mirari Vos*.

D. L. Scott

THREE BOOKS ON SPIRITUAL HEALING

The Church's Commission on Spiritual Healing is only one manifestation of the greatly increased interest in this department of Religion (which may also be considered as evidence of some dissatisfaction with orthodox medicine) and while the Commission sits, books on the subject from diverse sources, and providing more incontrovertible evidence of the power of the Spirit to heal, continue to appear. Mr. W. J. MacMillan, who attained considerable prominence in the Sunday press by the serialization of part of his life story *Reluctant Healer,* has continued his story, giving a partial account of his methods of healing in *Heaven and You* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7/6d.). Readers of his earlier book will recall how Mr. MacMillan was within a few months of being ordained into the Church of England when he discovered his healing powers, and felt an almost Jeremiac reluctance as well as compulsion to exercise them. His approach to healing is obviously a religious one.

> 'Is there one essential factor common to all healing methods, and part of the necessary equipment of all individual healers? I believe there is. This is a dominant belief in the existence of God . . . It seems probable that an African witch doctor is as successful with his cases as a Christian Healer—the operative fact in both cases is the conviction that a Divine Power outside himself rules the universe. The power by means of ritual and prayer can be induced to flow through certain types of human beings with a modifying result upon some other person.'

This, as he himself recognises, is dangerous and controversial ground, but his story is valuable as providing that sort of evidence which we hope the commission will take into account when making its findings. He goes on to say 'I believe love to be the common denominator of all successful healing' and it is the task of the healer as of the patient to respond to this love.

> 'Healing is the focusing of Divine Power upon a patient. Divine power is synonymous with Divine love. It is the infiltration of this Love which results in a cure.'

So in a highly entertaining but also illuminating case history of an imaginary Mr. Jones, we find Mr. Jones being told to get rid of hatred, both of other people and of himself or any part of his own body, for 'Hate appears almost literally to be a kind of poison'; and finally we find Mr. Jones being told 'if Mr. Jones wishes to be well he had better quickly learn how to love'. Mr. MacMillan does not appear to be quite sure himself how the healing powers work, but his method is one of prayer, meditation, laying on of hands and some manipulation, and he concludes, 'Healing cannot be done through man's inherent wisdom, but only through active co-operation with a Power unfettered by the normal inevitability of cause and effect.' Mr. MacMillan also records his failures—it is an honest and stimulating book.

There has also recently appeared an enlarged edition of a book by Albert Cliffe (ex Canadian dietician turned spiritual healer-member of the Anglican Church) *Lessons in Living* (Hodder & Stoughton, 7/6) and the book is indeed a spiritual tonic. It is purely Christian in outlook, and many of the stories of cures bear out MacMillan's contention that hatred is a poison, its presence inhibits health, its removal allows almost miraculous cures of long standing conditions such as arthritis and neuritis. It glows with a wonderful positive faith in the power of God to heal, and it is replete with a positive attitude to life, and tells many remarkable stories of the evil effects of negative thinking (such as we all indulge in daily). It contains among other things a wonderful meditation on the 23rd psalm, as well as much exceedingly sound psychological advice on how to manage one's thoughts and one's life, and the hard-pressed preacher will find in the stories and thoughts of this book a mine from which he will quarry many treasures, both new and old. The reviewer finds in this book a constant source of help and encouragement, and that the book, with its sub-title, 'A word to souls fainting in faith', and its opening dedicatory prayer

> 'I do not ask that crowds may throng the temple,
> That standing room may be at a price;
> I only ask that, as I voice the message,
> They may see Christ'

amply bears out this claim.

Mr. Cliffe is also director of a Bible class in Montreal which draws a regular attendance of thousands, and in 1950 he came to England under the auspices of the London Healing Mission.

Yet another book from a medical practitioner, Dr. Christopher Woodard, scion of a famous church family, can be added to the list (*A Doctor heals by Faith*; Parrish, 10/6). Dr. Woodard has an indomitable faith in God's power to heal even in the most hopeless cases, and of that power as made operative through a great deal of prayer. The book has many interesting case histories, well documented as might be expected of a medically trained writer, beginning with the story of the complete recovery of his own little son from meningitis when all the doctors had given him up. There is an interesting and rather more generous appreciation of the healings at Lourdes than Dr. Weatherhead has given in his book (*Psychology, Religion and Healing*) and Dr. Woodard is very wide in his sympathies and unorthodox in his approach. He will invoke the aid of anyone from Christian Science practitioners to Roman Catholics and all help, as well as orthodox methods of unction and laying on of hands. His book has a valuable final selection of healing hymns and prayers and accords with the two previous books in its estimate of the powers of hatred and fear.

'Since hate is with us still, I wish men love,
I wish since hovering hawks still strive to kill
The coming of the dove.
And since the ghouls of terror and despair are still abroad,
I wish the world once more within the care of those who have seen God.'

This is a fine book which should be studied by the nursing profession and all interested in spiritual healing. Dr. Woodard gives a valuable answer to that problem which immediately arises in the minds of all who try to practise as hospital chaplains or members of prayer groups as to why some people die unexpectedly and others as equally unexpectedly recover, when he says that when God intends a person to die, and spiritual healing is invoked, the person usually dies without pain and 'well', and he believes that to die a painful death is contrary to the will of God. He himself has a 'hunch' when God means the patient to die, but none the less he never ceases to pray for complete recovery, and he adds that when Christ does heal, the healing is never partial but total and complete. These three books, then, provide much valuable evidence of the power and scope of spiritual healing. May we hope that members of the Commission will take this and similar evidence into due consideration, and not be bound by the possible narrow view that 'extra ecclesiam nulla salus', and bear evidence to the increasingly self-evident truth that spiritual healing oversteps the bounds of all doctrinal and ecclesiastical man-made limits, and also that through individual dedicated healers, the power of the Holy Spirit is working to-day to heal, as it did in apostolic times.

J. S. Pearce-Higgins

CORRESPONDENCE

THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY BULLETIN

SIR,

One of the most valuable publications for all students of thought and research is the periodical Bulletin of The John Rylands Library. Dr. Edward Robertson, late Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature in the University of Manchester, is in every way a worthy successor as its Librarian of the late Dr. Guppy. The September number for 1954 is the latest in a succession that is without the impediments of sect or dogma.

In this number there is something for every thoughtful reader. Theological studies are, of course, as always, well to the fore. 1954 has seen the completion of the first fifty years of the Faculty of Theology in Manchester University — a pioneer Faculty in many ways. It is fitting that some account of this jubilee leads the librarian's Notes and News. For the foundation of a truly liberal theological faculty — to be expected in such a centre as Manchester — owed much to the benefactions of Mrs. Rylands, who founded the Rylands Chair of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis and gave generously to the maintenance of the professorship of Comparative Religion. The present Rylands Professor, T. W. Manson, recalls the close co-operation between the University and the Faculty of Theology.

C. J. WRIGHT

Barfrestone Rectory

ENGLAND EIGHT CENTURIES AGO

SIR,

I have read with interest the article by Canon Earle on England Eight Centuries Ago. May I be permitted to correct a few inaccuracies?

Canon Earle seems to exaggerate the extent of the Anarchy in England during the reign of Stephen. In fact, after about 1145, Stephen was recognized as king throughout most of the country and the civil war was confined to a small area in the west. William of Newburgh, on whom Canon Earle principally relies, is not a good authority for this period, and much of his information is little better than hearsay or gossip.

Henry Murdac, the Archbishop of York, failed to obtain papal sanction for the recognition of Eustace, Stephen's elder son (John of Salisbury's *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. R. L. Poole, pp. 85, 89). Possibly Canon Earle was misled on this point by the fact that both Murdac and Pope Eugenius were members of the Cistercian Order.

There was no Roger, Bishop of Winchester, at this time. Canon Earle seems to have confused two bishops, Roger of Salisbury and Henery of Winchester, both of whom played a vital part in the politics of Stephen's reign.

A. SALTMAN

Birkbeck College (University of London),
Malet Street, W.C.1

SIR,

I thank Mr. Saltman for his letter pointing out that I had transposed the names of the Bishops of Salisbury and Winchester. I selected William of Newburgh because he was born in this district, and surely he does not exaggerate the horrors of Stephen's reign, for the Peterborough Chronicler, writing the continuation of the 'Saxon Chronicle' at this time, surpasses in intensity the words used by William of Newburgh, and this is reproduced

in the *Cambridge Mediaeval History*. This description may be due to the appalling acts of brigandage of Geoffrey Earl of Essex which were perpetrated all about Peterborough in the Fen country.

That William of Newburgh, and other mediaeval writers, introduce into their histories digressions telling of strange miracles, monstrous prodigies, and portents 'in the sun and in the moon and in the stars', eclipses and comets signifying warnings to mankind, does them no discredit. They are but faithfully relating the spiritual and mental outlook of their day. In this sense even their fantasies may be considered to disclose a truly historical picture of their time.

The style of 'hearsay and gossip' is natural to their limitations, and is to me a part of their charm. No doubt their level of historical value varies. Would it not be true to say that some eminent modern historians, with all the wealth of modern means of research, have been at much pains to reproduce a sort of conversational, readable, homely, companionable style in order to make past ages real and living to the 'ordinary man' of to-day, whose reaction has been so responsive that some such modern histories have had immense circulations.

I sometimes wonder whether the policy of William I to lay waste the north 'from sea to sea' and as far south as Cheshire and Derbyshire, and 'to exterminate its inhabitants' was not still showing its effects and sad traces in Stephen's day, only 75 years or so later.

I fully accept all that is said of the distinguished mediaevalist, A. L. Poole. The *Fasti Eboracenses*, p. 218, from Roger of Howden, refers to the visit of Archbishop Henry Murdac to Rome 'as an ambassador to procure from the Chief Pontiff a formal recognition of the right of Eustace, King Stephen's son, to succeed to the throne of England'.

A. Earle

Wansford Vicarage,
East Yorks

STUDY OF RELIGIONS: GREAT BRITAIN SECTION

Sir,

The International Association for the Study of the History of Religions, which has grown out of the several History of Religions Congresses held in different European capitals over the past half-century (Paris 1900, Bale 1904, Oxford 1908, Leyden 1912, Lund 1927, Brussels 1935, Amsterdam 1950), has a number of affiliated national sub-associations. Professor R. Pettazzoni of Rome, the president, and Professor C. J. Bleeker of Amsterdam, the secretary, are anxious that Great Britain should not be unrepresented. A British section has, therefore, been formed; and it is hoped that British scholars interested in the history of religions and its kindred studies will join. We shall be glad to give fuller information to any who will communicate with us at Neuadd Reichel, University College of North Wales, Bangor.

E. O. James
D. W. Gundry

OXFORD TRIUMPHANT AND THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

Sir,

In the editorial note on *Oxford Triumphant* in your June issue, you say that 'it is significant that the women's colleges have no chaplains'. Significant of what? If it is significant of Mr. Longmate's statement that only one in three of the women undergraduates attend a place of worship as compared with one in two of the men, it must be emphasized that, as was pointed

out in the *Oxford Magazine*, Mr. Longmate's statistics have no validity whatever.

Several of the women's colleges do in fact have chaplains, who celebrate Holy Communion in their chapels and hold classes and discussions on religious topics. There are also women with qualifications in Theology who work in connection with certain churches. The difficulty which women encounter is their lack of official status. A resident chaplain, or the alternative, a properly qualified woman attached to the University church in a position where she would be widely recognized, is rendered impossible by the refusal of the Church of England to give a woman theologian any recognized place in the ordained ministry of the Church. If this door were opened to women, such a woman might have a considerable influence not only among the women, but among the men also.

C. S. WILKINSON, M.A.,
Hon. Sec., S.E.M.C.

42 Crutched Friars, London, E.C.3

EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF DISCUSSION

SIR,

In his paper, 'Work, Leisure, and Religion', read by him before the Modern Churchmen's Conference, John Marsh said something which, in my view, was pure gold. It was this:

> 'The provision of opportunties for discussion is one of the finest ways of opening men's minds and keeping them open. The chairman's monologue, the lecturer's hour-long dissertation, the priest's jargon-ridden sermon on eternal truths must be sparingly used in an age when exhortation from without has failed. *I believe that man is very ready to listen to the divine promptings from within himself'*. (Italics mine.)

Surely here is the much-needed protest against the defeatist stuff continually dished out to us from our pulpits and over the radio—that as human beings we can do nothing of ourselves *without outside aid*. This *co-called* Christian message is not a Gospel—Good News—it's a Dirge. *As human beings* we are sunk!

Mr. Marsh has splendidly emphasized Saint Joan's immortal declaration before her ecclesiastical judges—'Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him. *But I will maintain my own ways before Him.'*

MALCOLM RUTT

NEWS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

It is most important in the interests of Liberal Churchmanship that the activities of the Modern Churchmen's Union should be more widely and better known. Henceforth, the *Modern Churchman* will publish regularly contributions recording the plans and policies of the Modern Churchmen's Union Council. This will constitute an important link between the membership of the Modern Churchmen's Union and the central office. In response to our request, the Director and Secretary has sent us the first of what we hope may be a long series of stimulating contributions.

TO the Members of the Modern Churchmen's Union:

I write this immediately after having come from a lively and decisive meeting of the Council. One of the most important subjects of discussion was the initiative we are taking with regard to Christian reunion. Next spring, Convocations will have to decide what the future relationship shall be between the Church of England and the Church of South India. At the request of the Council one of our members, Dr. E. C. Dewick, who has recently visited India and is an authority on the religious situation there, has drawn up a draft statement of the liberal attitude. In this he has had the co-operation and advice of several other theologians who have specialized in the problem. The Council are agreed that the resulting document is a very fine piece of work. The A.E.G.M. is entirely at one with us in this, and together we shall seek other support to show that the hopes expressed are widely representative. The final revision has yet to be made, but this is, I am sure, the first attempt by Liberal Churchmen to formulate opinion on this subject in a systematic way.

Another vital issue before the Church is that of Canon Law revision. A sub-committee of the Council is now at work considering the proposals at present passing through the Convocations. It really is astonishing how little interest this important legislation has raised and how little discussion of it there has been among the general public. Church people need educating in the significance of it. The sub-committee has this need in mind and will not wait until some cut-and-dried formula is agreed upon before opening the discussion. Once again we Liberal Churchmen shall try to draw in others who share our outlook on this matter so as to gain the maximum influence.

There was a good response (far better than I had dared to hope) to my request for information about the consequences for the pastoral work of the Church of the 'official attitude' to divorce and

re-marriage. The term 'official attitude' is rapidly becoming a by-word. Examination of this survey showed the membership of the Union to be overwhelmingly in favour of leaving the question of re-marrying in church those who have endured the divorce courts to the discretion of the clergy. In fact hardly anybody took the other view. From the information supplied I was able to compile a list of forty-one case-histories typical of the result for individuals who have sought re-marriage in church. They make a distressing record of calamity. The 'official attitude' is obviously having disastrous effects. Refusal of the church service is scarcely ever felt as a challenge to conscience, but almost invariably as a senseless injustice. Refusal of Holy Communion is thought to imply that the Church has no use for troubled souls but values only the righteous. These refusals usually mean that not only the parties directly involved but their families as well are lost to the Church. Clergy resort to all kinds of ways of fulfilling what they believe to be the will of Christ in this matter. Some hold services in the houses of the parties after the Registry Office ceremony. Some send the couples to the Free Churches. Your representatives have already been able to make good use of this survey, and I shall find other means of making the results public.

Another sub-committee is at work commissioning new pamphlets written in such a way as to be intelligible to people who are of General Certificate of Education standard. In these we shall assert the positive strength of our faith as Liberal Churchmen and show how genuine religious security is to be found. We shall expose the illusory nature of the security which Fundamentalism offers, and so give assistance to many who are in doubt as to what they ought to believe.

We hope also to form a group of Christians engaged in industry and commerce who will together think out and write a rather larger publication which will show the meaning of the Christian faith for practical affairs in home and industry.

Meanwhile the series of lunch-time addresses in St. Margaret's Church, Lothbury, in the City, has been very successful, and we have had a list of able speakers on practical and social subjects. We shall have a brief respite during December and recommence in January.

All these initiatives are expensive, and the Council warmly thanks those who are enabling the Union to bear the burden. We have recently had a number of generous gifts, and many members have regarded the annual subscription as a minimum. But to suggest that we are in a good financial position would be untrue. We are not, and we need much more help in this way.

May I suggest an aspiration which would make a fitting starting point for our prayers : *A nation worthy of a Church and a Church able to be the nation's Church.*

CLIFFORD O. RHODES,
Director and Secretary

THE OXFORD MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE, 1955

The thirty-eighth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen (our first was held in Ripon (July 1914) on the eve of the First World War) is to be held in Oxford, Monday, July 25, till Friday, July 29.

Thanks to the hospitality of the authorities of Somerville College all members of the Conference can be accommodated there, and all services and sermons will take place in its chapel and all Conference papers will be delivered in the College lecture rooms. This centralization will add much to the convenience and comfort of members.

The Conference will begin on Monday, July 25, tea time, and conclude after early luncheon on Friday, July 29. This will allow time for the Presidential address, the Conference sermon and twelve papers to be delivered and discussed, and permit a daily period of freedom from 2 p.m. to 6.30 p.m.

As the organizers of the Conference hold that the papers, discussions and social intercourse provided have particular value for young clergymen and schoolmasters engaged in religious education they are glad to make financial concessions in order to facilitate attendance. Applicants are advised to notify the Secretary to this effect when applying for tickets.

All, whatever their religious denomination who are interested in the aims and claims, the development and potentialities of modern liberal Christianity, are welcome as members of the Conference.

The Conference Programme, with a full list of the contributors and their subjects, will be published in the March number of the *Modern Churchman*.

A. W. ADAMS
(Chairman of the Modern Churchmen's Conference Committee)